





THE
NOVELTY OF POPERY,
AND
THE ANTIQUITY
OF THE
RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS,
PROVED BY
SCRIPTURE AND HISTORY.

PHILADELPHIA: 
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

WILLIAM S. MARTIN, PUBLISHING AGENT.

1840.

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS
—
WASHINGTON

BX 1765
.N8

LC Control Number



tmp96 028022

INTRODUCTION.

“WHERE was the Protestant religion before Luther?” is a question that has often been asked with an air of confidence and triumph, by the advocates of a church which claims to be the only infallible expounder of the word of God. The object of the following essay is to answer this question, and to retort the charge of novelty in religion, on those who make such arrogant claims for the antiquity of their church.

The *importance* of the question will be evident to every one who considers, that it relates not merely to some unessential doctrines, or external observances, but to the very foundation of a sinner's hope. If the Popish system be true, Protestants are left to the “*uncovenanted* mercies of God;” without a ministry, without sacraments, without hope! If it is false, how awful is the delusion, and how imminent the danger of those who rest all their hopes of salvation upon it!

That the discussion is *seasonable*, must be apparent to all who are awake to the signs of the times. Zealous emissaries, backed by foreign influence, and aided by foreign gold, are coming in like a flood, to poison the fountains of education, and to bring the civil and reli-

gious liberties of this happy land into subjection to a foreign ecclesiastical despotism.

The original work, from which the following treatise is extracted, consists of a series of discourses, on the principal errors of Popery, styled the "Cripplegate Lectures," which were delivered by eminent English divines, in and near London, about the end of the seventeenth century. The discourses bear ample testimony to the learning, judgment and piety of their authors.

In preparing the work for the press, some liberty has been taken in retrenching irrelevant matter, and in somewhat modernizing the style. Should it be objected that the quotations made from catholic authors are of ancient date, and that the Popish religion of the nineteenth century is very different from that of the sixteenth and seventeenth, it would not be difficult to produce from catholic works, printed *by authority*, in this city, within a year or two, sentiments as unscrip-
tural as any quoted in this work. Besides, the objection would come with a very ill grace from those who boast that their church is always and every where the same—" *Nulla vestigia retrorsum.*"

THE
NOVELTY OF POPERY.

CHAPTER I.

For the better understanding of the matter in hand, I shall premise the seven following propositions:

FIRST PROPOSITION.

That the ordinary way in which lost sinners, since the fall of Adam, have been recovered and restored to life and salvation, as to the essentials of the covenant of grace, has, in all ages, been one and the same. For though God has, “at sundry times and in divers manners,” revealed his will to his church, yet the covenant of grace, under various external dispensations, has been the same;* under the law, administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, and circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types

* *Ea quippe fides justos servavit antiquos, quæ et nos. i. e. Mediatoris Dei et hominis Jesu Christi. Aug. de Natur. et Grat: cap. 44. Heb. i. 1: πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως.*

and ordinances, delivered to the people of the Jews,* all pointing at Christ to come; under the Gospel, by the preaching of the word, and administration of the sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, which is observed in commemoration of the death of Christ, already past. The way to heaven through Christ, has been the same, successively from Adam to our days, and will be the same to the end of the world; which we might learn from the perfect agreement between the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, and Christ and his apostles; for these, declaring the whole counsel of God, Acts xviii. 27, yet preached no new doctrine concerning Christ and salvation by him, but what Moses and the prophets said, and that also in reference to the Gentiles, as well as to the Jews, Acts xxvi. 22, 23. To believe in Christ, to love God above all, to repent, and mortify sin, to be sanctified and renewed after the image of God, to be obedient to the will of God, has been "the good way" from of old. The change in outward administrations made by Christ and the apostles, did not make a new way to heaven, though the old dispensations then ceased, and gave place to those appointed by Christ, which, with the doctrines of the apostles, are retained in the reformed church, but are depraved, corrupted, and departed

* *Christi veri sacrificii multiplicia variaque signa erant sacrificia prisca sanctorum, cum hoc unum per multa figuraretur, tanquam verbis multis res una diceretur, ut sine fastidio multum commendatur. Aug. de Civit: Dei, lib. 10: cap. 20.*

from by the church of Rome, as will appear by the parallel of doctrines.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

Antiquity is not a mark of a true church. A church of long standing and continuance, successively from age to age, might be a false church. The church of Rome, contrary to all reason, makes antiquity a mark,* whereby a true church may be known; and, contrary to all history, brags of her own antiquity. But that which is a mark to distinguish one thing from another, must be found† in one kind, in all of that kind, only in that kind, and yet always in it; as a man has two feet, but thereby cannot be distinguished from some other creatures, because this is common to birds as well as men. So to be skilful in music, is proper only to man, but is not found in every man, and therefore is no mark to know a man by; for one that is no musician, is a true and real man, as well as he that is.

Antiquity, alone considered, will fall short of a

* *Secunda nota ecclesiæ est antiquitas; nostra autem ecclesia, quam adversarii papisticam vocant, est illa ipsa quam Christus instituit, et proinde vetustior omnibus sectis hæreticorum.* Bell. de Concil. et Eccles. l. 4. c. 5.

† *Proprium convenit soli alicui speciei, omnibusque illius individuis et semper. Tres notarum conditiones ponit, Bellarm. 1. Debent esse propriæ, non communes. 2. Debent esse notiores eâ re eujus sunt notæ, alioqui non sunt notæ, sed ignotæ. 3. Sunt inseparabiles à verâ ecclesiâ. De Concil. et Eccles. Lib. 4. cap. 2.*

demonstration or evidence, that the church of Rome is the only true church, upon these two grounds or reasons.

1. Because antiquity is separable from a true church; as the church of God in Adam's days, was a true church, and yet it was not then an ancient church. And the Christian church, in the apostles' days, was a true Christian church, and yet it was not then an ancient Christian church, any more than an infant newly born, may be said to be an old man; and yet it is a true man, though not old.

2. Because antiquity is not only separable from a true church, but is also common to other things now, as well as to a true church. It might even be spoken of the synagogue of Satan; for Satan has had his followers in the world for many thousand years; and there have been many wicked and ungodly societies of men, far more ancient than the church of Rome, or any pope at the head of it. So that the antiquity which the church of Rome boasts of, but does not possess, cannot prove it to be the true church of Christ, any more than the synagogue of Satan.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

Antiquity is not a mark of true doctrine; for although all truth is more ancient than error (which is a corruption of truth), yet every doctrine that is old,* or of many hundred years' standing is not

* Quodcunque adversus veritatem sapit, hoc erit hæresis, etiam vetus consuetudo. Tertul. de Virg. Veland.

therefore true; for there are old errors, and old heresies; some of them more ancient than those that are properly and formally popish errors. There are the old errors and heresies of Cerinthus, Ebion, Arius, and many more, of an earlier original, than the main doctrines of popery, that are essential to that religion; and if we judge of doctrines merely by antiquity, many heresies have the precedency of popery. Since then wickedness and error can plead antiquity of many ages; it is plain that antiquity is a praise or dispraise, according to the nature of the thing of which it is spoken; if it be good, the older, the better; if it be bad, the older, the worse; continuance in sin being an aggravation of it; as an old swearer, an old drunkard or idolater is worse than one that has lately taken up such wicked practices. Antiquity of doctrine and worship without truth and purity being but* grey-headed error and sin, it follows that the longer the church of Rome has practised such worship, and taught such doctrines, she is not so venerable for her antiquity, as vile for her iniquity.

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

Some of the popish doctrines, and some parts of popish worship are older, and of a longer standing than others. Rome was not built in one day; and the body and system of popish doctrine, as it is

* *Consuetudo sine veritate, vetustas erroris est.* Cypr. Epist. ad Pompeium.

now held, was not finished in one age. Popery came in by degrees, and antichrist rose to his present height, step by step. The question* propounded by the papists to be resolved by the protestants, who was the first pope that brought in their religion, and who was the first that made all the innovations we complain of? is ridiculous and absurd, supposing that to be introduced into the church by one man, in one age, which was brought in gradually, by many men, in many ages.

FIFTH PROPOSITION.

Those things that are essential to our religion, are owned by the papists themselves; for they profess to own the Scripture to be the word of God, and certainly true; but they add their own traditions, things not contained in the Scripture, as necessary to salvation; which we cannot receive. They own Christ to be the head of the church, and so do we; but they add that the pope is the head of the universal church also, which we deny; they own baptism and the Lord's supper, and so do we; but they add five sacraments more, which we reject. They own that there is a heaven and a hell, as well as we; but they teach that there is a place distinct

* In omni insigni mutatione religionis semper ista sex demonstrari possunt. 1. Auctor ejus. 2. Dogma aliquod novum. 3. Tempus quo cœpit. 4. Locus ubi cœpit. 5. Quis eam oppugnaverit. 6. Exiguus aliquis cœtus, unde paulatim aliis accedentibus, cœperit. Nihil autem horum de nobis ostendere possunt, (Hæretici). Bellarm. de Concil. et Eccles, lib. 4. cap. 5.

from both, in which the souls of believers were before Christ's death; and that there is a purgatory, and a place for the souls of infants, distinct from heaven and hell; all which we deny. They own the merits of Christ, and so do we; but they add their own merits, which we deny; and so in other points. So that the controversy between us and them is not, whether what we hold is true and old; for that is granted by the papists themselves,* as to the essential parts of our religion; but about what they have invented, and added to the true religion. All our religion is contained in the Scripture, and what is there, we own, and nothing else, as necessary to salvation. The sum of our religion is comprehended in the ten commandments, creed, and Lord's prayer, which the papists also confess and own. So that our religion is past dispute, and is in a manner granted to us. But whether the popish doctrines as such, are true and old, is the very controversy between us and them.

SIXTH PROPOSITION.

The reformation of the church does not consist in bringing in new things, but in casting them out, and lopping them off. It is a gross mistake that in

* Nota secundo ea quæ sunt simpliciter necessaria, apostolos consuevisse omnibus prædicare, — Dico, illa omnia scripta esse ab apostolis, quæ sunt omnibus necessaria, et quæ ipsi palam omnibus vulgo prædicaverunt. Bell. de Verb. Dei. Lib. 4. cap. 11.

the reformation, in and since Luther's time, the church has brought in new doctrines, and rejected the old. On the contrary she has cast away the new, and retains the old. Gold and dross were mixed together; the jewel of truth was hid under the filth of corrupt doctrines. Our reformers kept the jewel and the gold, and cast the dross and filth away. The reception of the old doctrine, and the rejection of the new, is that which constituted the reformation. And if the church of Rome would own what is in the Scripture, and no more, as necessary to salvation, and would cut off the new, which they have added to the old, we and they should be of the same religion. Our religion was perfect and complete before the doctrine and the worship of the church of Rome (as it now is) were in being.

SEVENTH PROPOSITION.

To know which is the old religion and which the new, we must keep to the word* of God, as the rule and test. What is not in the word of God, either expressly, or by just, immediate, necessary consequence, and yet is made necessary to salvation, is certainly a new religion, though it has been taught many hundred years. Thus all false gods, though long since served and worshipped, are called "new gods, that newly came up," Deut.

* Si ad divinæ traditionis caput, et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus. Cypr. Epist. ad Pomp.

xxxii. 17. The old religion then must be examined by the old rule, the Holy Scriptures; so that to determine this, we need not run to the canons of the church, to the councils of men, to the decrees of the pope, or to the writings of the fathers, which are all fallible, and of later standing than the word of God. When therefore the papists ask us, "Where was your religion before Luther?" we may confidently answer, "Where your religion never was, nor will be found; and that is, in the Holy Scriptures, which were written long before Luther was born, or the pope either."

CHAPTER II.

THE second general head in the method proposed, is to give a parallel of doctrines taught by the prophets, Christ, and his apostles; by the protestants or reformed church; and by the papists or the church of Rome. The first shall be laid down in the very words of Scripture; the second out of the public confessions of faith of the reformed churches; and the third out of the writings and decretals of the popes, councils, cardinals, and other doctors approved by the church of Rome. By all which, these three things will be made manifest: 1. That the doctrine of protestants is the same that was taught by Christ and his apostles. 2. That therefore it was long before Luther. 3. That the doctrine of the church of Rome, differing from, and being contrary to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, must be a novelty.

I. *Concerning the Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture unto Salvation.*

1. The doctrine of the prophets, Christ and the apostles concerning this point:

Deut. xii. 32. What thing soever I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it. Psal. xix. 7. The law of the Lord

is perfect, converting the soul. John xx. 31. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name. Gal. i. 8. But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. 9. As I said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel to you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed. 2 Tim. iii. 15. And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 16. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; 17. That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Rev. xxii. 18. For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book. 19. And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.

2. The doctrine of the reformed churches concerning the perfection and sufficiency of the Scripture unto salvation.

“The Holy Scripture contains all things necessary

for salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite and necessary to salvation.”*

“It is not lawful for the church to ordain any thing, that is contrary to God’s word:—as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.”†

“The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture; unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.”‡

“The canonical Scripture, or the word of God delivered by the Holy Ghost, and by the prophets and apostles propounded to the world, is the most perfect and ancient philosophy, and doth alone perfectly contain all piety, all rule of life.”§

The reformed church in France, thus. || “Whereas the word of God is the sum of all truth, con-

* Church of England. Artic. 6.

† Artic. 20.

‡ Assemb. Confession of Faith.

§ Confessio Helvet. Synta. Confes. p. 67.

|| Quum verbum Dei sit omnis veritatis summa, complectens quicquid ad cultum Dei et salutem nostram requiritur, neque hominibus, neque ipsis etiam angelis fas esse dicimus quicquam

taining whatsoever is requisite to the worship of God and our salvation; we affirm that it is not lawful for men or angels either to add any thing to it, or take away any thing from it, nor to change any thing at all therein; from whence it follows, that it is not lawful to set, either antiquity, or custom, or a multitude, or human wisdom, opinions, decrees, councils, or visions, or miracles, in opposition to divine Scripture; but rather that all things ought to be examined and tried according to this rule, and what is prescribed therein.”

The Belgic Confession thus.* “We believe that the Holy Scripture doth perfectly contain the will of God, and that whatsoever is necessary to be believed by men, for the obtaining of salvation, is sufficiently taught therein. For when it is forbidden that any should add to it, or take away from it, thereby is abundantly demonstrated, that the doctrine thereof is most perfect, and every way complete.”

*ei verbo adjicere, vel detrahere, vel quicquam prorsus in eo im-
mutare. Ex hoc autem efficitur, neque antiquitatem, neque
consuetudines, neque multitudinem, neque humanam sapien-
tiam, neque judicia, neque edicta vel decreta ulla, neque con-
cilia, neque visiones, neque miracula, Scripturæ illi divinæ op-
ponere licere: sed potius omnia ad ejus regulam et præscriptum
examinari et exigi oportere. Gallic. Confes. in Syntag. Confes
p. 78.*

* Credimus sacram hanc scripturam, Dei voluntatem perfectè complecti, et quodcunque ab hominibus, ut salutem consequantur, credi necesse est, in illâ sufficienter edoceri:—Quum

The Wittemberg Confession,* “That all doctrine necessary to be known by us in order to true and eternal salvation is not contained in the Scripture is sooner said than proved.”

To add no more, by these it is evident that in this point the reformed churches not only agree among themselves, but also with the prophets and apostles, teaching herein the same doctrine that Christ and they did, which was the thing to be proved.

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning the perfection and sufficiency of the Scripture.

The Council of Trent declared,† “That the doctrine of the gospel is contained in the written word, and in unwritten traditions, and that they receive and honour the unwritten traditions, whether appertaining to faith, or manners, with the same re-

enim vetitum sit, ne quis Dei verbo quicquam addat, aut detrahat, satis eo ipso demonstratur, doctrinam illius perfectissimam, omnibusque modis consummatam esse. Belg. Eccles. Confes. Syntag. p. 131.

* In hâc Scripturâ non contineri omnem doctrinam, nobis ad veram et perpetuam salutem cognitu necessariam, videtur facilius posse dici, quàm probari. Wittemb. Confes. Syntag. p. 130.

† Sacrosancta, Tridentina synodus, perspicuens hanc veritatem [evangelii] et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis, et sine scripto traditionibus, omnes libros tam veteris quam novi Testamenti, nec non traditiones ipsas, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, pari pietatis affectu ac reverentiâ suscipit et veneratur. Concil. Trident. Sess. 4.

verence and holy affection, as they do all the books of the Old and New Testament.”

The Canon law says,* “That men do with such reverence respect the apostolical seat of Rome, that they rather desire to know the ancient institution of the Christian religion from the pope’s mouth, than from the Holy Scripture, and the traditions of the fathers; and they only inquire what is his pleasure, and according to it, they order their life and conversation.” Again,† “that the [pope’s] decretal epistles are to be numbered with canonical Scripture.”

Dr. Standish, in his book against English Bibles, says, “Take from them the English damnable translations, and let them learn to give as much credit, to that which is not expressed, as to that which is expressed in the Scripture.”

Melchior Canus writes,‡ “That many things be-

* Et revera tantâ reverentiâ apicem præfatæ apostolicæ sedis omnes suspiciunt, ut antiquam Christianæ religionis institutionem magis ab ore præcessoris ejus, quam à sacris paginis, et paternis traditionibus expetant: illius velle, illius nolle tantum explorant, ut ad ejus arbitrium suam conversationem et ipsi remittant, aut intendant. Corp. Jur. Canon. Dist. 40. si Papa in Annot.

† Inter canonicas Scripturas decretales epistolæ connumerantur. Corp. Juris. Canon. Dist. 19, cap. 6.

‡ Multa pertinere ad Christianorum fidem et doctrinam quæ nec apertè, nec obscurè, in sacris literis continentur.—Sanctorum martyrum auxilium precibus implorandum, eorumque memorias celebrandas, imagines venerandas esse, in sacrificio eucharistiæ simul cum corpore sanguinem sacerdotibus esse et

long to Christian faith and doctrine, which are neither plainly nor obscurely contained in Holy Scripture.” And he gives particular instances, “That the help of the holy martyrs should be craved by prayer, and their memories celebrated, and their images worshipped, &c., is not perhaps taught in the Holy Scripture, and yet the catholic church as firmly holds these and many other doctrines as if they were written in Holy Scripture.” Again he says, “There is more efficacy for the confutation of heretics in tradition, than in Scripture.” Again, “Almost all disputations with heretics should be referred to the traditions received from our forefathers.”

Cardinal Hosius speaks out, saying,* “The greatest part of the gospel is come to us by tradition, very little of it is committed to writing.”

This plainly shows that the doctrine of the papists in this, is expressly contrary to the doctrine of

conficiendum, et sumendum, &c., Sacræ literæ nusquam fortè tradiderunt. At ejusmodi atque alia pleraque id genus, ita firmiter ecclesia catholica retinet, ut si sacris codicibus fuissent inscripta: Melch. Can. Loc. Theolog. lib. 3. cap. 3. Adde, quod ad confutandos hæreticos major vis in traditione, quàm in Scripturâ est.—Quorsum hæc tam longo sermone repetita? Nempe ut intelligas, non modo adversum hæreticos plus habere traditionem, quàm Scripturam virium, sed etiam omnem fermè cum hæreticis disputationem ad traditiones à majoribus acceptas esse referendam: Ibid.

* Multòque maxima pars evangelii pervenit ad nos traditione, perexigua literis est mandata. Hosius Confes. Fid. Cathol. cap. 92. pag. 133. fol.

the prophets, Christ, and his apostles, and that the doctrine of the protestants is the very same with the doctrine of Christ and the apostles. Let the reader compare them together, and he will see the agreement of the one, and the contrariety of the other, to the doctrine of Scripture, and conclude that the doctrine of the reformed church is the old and true, but the doctrine of the church of Rome, is both new and false doctrine; and that what the Rhemists on Gal. i. 8, say, "It is great pity and shame that so many follow Luther and Calvin, and such other lewd fellows into a new gospel;" is more true of, and better applied to the followers of the popish doctors, or of the Rhemists themselves; who on 2 Tim. iii. 16, say, "The heretics upon this commendation of Holy Scriptures, pretend (very simply in good sooth) that therefore nothing is necessary to justice and salvation but the Scriptures." And on John xxi. 25. "Few things are written of Christ's acts and doctrine in comparison of that which he did and spake, and yet the heretics will needs have all in Scripture." Whereas the evangelist does not say that any thing is omitted of his doctrine, but of his acts. For though he spoke more words than are expressed, yet all the doctrines that he uttered in those words, are contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The apostles preached nothing but that which was contained in the Scriptures, Acts xvii. 11. and xxvi. 22. Rom. i. 2. Fulke in Loc.

II. *Of Reading the Scripture.*

1. The doctrine of the prophets, Christ, and his apostles concerning the common people's reading and knowing the Scripture.

Deut. xxxi. 12. "Gather the people together, men, and women, and children, and thy stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law. 13. And that their children which have not known any thing, may hear and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the land." Josh. viii. 35. "There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the congregation of Israel, with the women and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." Psal. i. 2. "His delight is in the law of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Acts viii. 28.—"Was returning and sitting in his chariot, read Isaias the prophet." John v. 39. "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." Acts xvii. 11. "And these were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Ephes. iii. 4. "Whereby when ye read ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ." Col. iii. 16. "Let the word of God

dwell in you richly in all wisdom." 1 Thes. v. 27. "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." 2 Tim. iii. 15. "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures." Rev. i. 3. "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things that are written therein."

2. The doctrine of the protestants and reformed churches concerning the people's reading and knowing the Scriptures.

"Because the original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have a right to, and interest in, the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them, therefore they are to be translated. All sorts of people are bound to read it [the word of God] apart by themselves, and with their families." "It is lawful for all men privately at home to read the Holy Scriptures, and by instructions to edify one another in the true religion."*

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning the people's having, or reading the Scripture.

"Whereas experience teaches, that if the Bible be everywhere without difference, permitted in the vulgar tongue, through men's unadvisedness, more hurt than good arises thereby, in this point let the judgment of the bishop, or inquisitor be followed;

* *Omnibus sacras literas privatim legere domi, et instruendo ædificare mutuum in vera religione liceat. Confes. Helvet. cap. 22.*

that with the advice of the parish priest, or confessor, they may grant the reading of the Bible, translated by catholic authors, in the vulgar language, to such as they shall understand, can take no hurt by such reading, but increase of faith and godliness. Which license let them have in writing. And if any presume without such license either to read or have it, unless they first deliver up their Bibles to the ordinary, they cannot have the pardon of their sins. And the booksellers, that without such license, shall sell, or any way afford Bibles in the vulgar language, shall forfeit the price of the books, to be converted by the bishop to pious uses, and be liable to such other penalties according to the quality of the offence, as the bishop shall think meet.”*

Though it is not agreeable to the doctrine of

* Cum experimento manifestum sit, si sacra Biblia vulgari linguâ passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri, hac in parte iudicio episcopi, aut inquisitoris stetur, ut cum consilio parochi, vel confessorii, Bibliorum, à catholicis auctoribus versorum, lectionem in vulgari linguâ eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint, ex hujusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei atque pietatis augmentum capere posse, quam facultatem in Scriptis habeant. Qui autem absque tali facultate ea legere, aut habere, præsumserint, nisi prius Bibliis ordinario redditis, peccatorum absolutionem percipere non possint. Bibliopolæ verò, qui prædictam facultatem non habenti, Biblia idiomate vulgari conscripta vendiderint, vel alio quovis modo concesserint, librorum pretium, in usus pios ab episcopo convertendum, amittant, aliisque pœnis pro delicti qualitate ejusdem episcopi arbitrio subjaceant. Index. Lib. prohib. Regul. 4.

Christ and his apostles, that men must not read the Scripture without a license from men, for so what is strictly commanded by God, would be at the pleasure of others, whether God be obeyed or no; and some liberty by pope Pius IV. seems to be granted for the reading of the Bible, to whom they please, yet it is taken away fully by pope Clement VIII., in his observation on the before alleged rule, in these words:

“It is to be observed concerning this rule of Pius IV.,* that by this impression and edition, no new power is granted to bishops, or inquisitors, or superiors, to license the buying, reading, or keeping the Bible in the vulgar tongue, seeing, hitherto, by the command and practice of the holy Roman and universal inquisition, the power of granting such licenses, to read or keep Bibles in the vulgar language, or any parts of the Holy Scripture, as well of the New as of the Old Testament, or any sums or his-

* Animadvertendum est circa supra scriptam quartam regulam indicis Pii papæ IV. nullam per hanc impressionem et editionem de novo tribui facultatem episcopis, vel inquisitoribus, aut regularium superioribus, concedendi licentiam emendi, legendi, aut retinendi Biblia vulgari linguâ edita, cum hætenus mandato et usu sanctæ Romanæ et universalis inquisitionis sublata eis fuerit facultas concedendi hujusmodi licentias legendi, vel retinendi Biblia vulgaria, aut alias Sacræ Scripturæ tam novi, quam veteris Testamenti partes quavis vulgari linguâ editas: ac insuper summaria et compendia etiam historica eorundem Biblicorum, seu librorum Sacræ Scripturæ, quocunque vulgari idiomate conscripta: quod quidem inviolate servandum est. Ind. Lib. Prohib. Observat. Circa Reg. 4.

torical abridgments of the same, in any vulgar language, has been taken from them; which inviolably is to be observed.”

Cardinal Bellarmin,* to the same purpose, teaches, “That the people would get not only no good, but much hurt from the Scriptures; for they would easily take occasion of erring, both in doctrines of faith, and in precepts concerning life and manners.”

Peresius (quoted by Dr. White,) saith, “Shall no bounds be set to popular, rude, and carnal men? Shall old men, before they have put off the filth of their mind, and young men that yet speak like children, be admitted to read the Scripture? I suppose verily, (and my opinion fails me not,) this ordinance under the pretence of piety, was invented by the devil.”

The Rhemist translators, in their preface, write in these words: “Which translation we do not publish upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that they ought, or were ordained of God to be read indifferently of all; or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God’s word and honour, or edification of the faith, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in

* *Populus non solum non caperet fructum ex Scripturis, sed etiam caperet detrimentum: acciperet enim facillimè occasionem errandi, tum in doctrinâ fidei, tum in præceptis vitæ et morum.* Bellar. de Verb. Dei. lib. 2. cap. 15.

the ecclesiastical learned languages. The wise will not regard what some wilful people do mutter, that the Scriptures are made for all men; and that it is of envy, that the priests do keep the holy book from them: which suggestion cometh of the same serpent that seduced our first parents, who persuaded them that God had forbidden them that tree of knowledge, lest they should be as cunning as himself, and like unto the Highest. No, no, the church doth it to keep them from blind ignorant presumption, and from that which the Apostle calls ‘knowledge, falsely so called,’ and not to bar them from the true knowledge of Christ. She knoweth how to do it without casting the holy to dogs, or pearls to hogs.”

Bravely said! O the excellent art of the mother church, that by keeping her sons and daughters ignorant of the word of God (the means of knowledge), keeps them from blindness and ignorance! Who ever thought, that, to keep people in ignorance, was the way to keep them from it? What a pretty conceit is this, that they bar the people from knowing the Scripture, and yet do not bar them from the knowledge of Christ? When Christ bids us search the Scriptures, for they are they that testify of him.

III. *Of Religious Worship in a known Tongue.*

1. The doctrine of the Scripture concerning this point:

1 Corinthians xiv. 2. “He that speaketh in an

unknown tongue, speaketh not to men, but to God, for no man understandeth him; howbeit, in the spirit, he speaketh mysteries." Read ver. 3—8. 9. "So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak unto the air." v. 11. "If I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." 14. "For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful." 16. "Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen, at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest." 18. "I thank my God I speak with tongues more than you all." 19. "Yet in the church, I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." Read also ver. 22—28.

2. The doctrine of the reformed churches, concerning religious worship in a known tongue.

"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the word of God, and the custom of the primitive church, to have public prayer in the church, or to minister sacraments, in a tongue not understood by the people."*

"Because the original tongues are not known to all the people, who have right unto, and interest in

* Church of England, Artic. 24.

the Scriptures, and are commanded in the fear of God to read and search them; therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they might worship him in an acceptable manner.”*

“Let all things in the church be done decently and in order; finally let all things be done to edification; therefore let all strange tongues keep silence in the holy assemblies; let all things be uttered in the vulgar tongue, which is understood of all men in the company.”†

“Contrary to the express command of the Holy Ghost, in it, (the catholic church) all things are said and sung in a language which the people do not understand.”‡

“What hath been already said concerning the use of a language known to the common people, is to be understood not only in singing of psalms, but also of all the parts of the ecclesiastical ministry; for as sermons and prayers ought to be in a tongue known unto the church, so also should the sacraments be dispensed in a known language; for though it be

* Assemb. Confes.

† Omnia decenter et ordine fiant in ecclesia, omnia denique fiant ad ædificationem, taceant ergo omnes peregrinæ linguæ in cœtibus sacris: omnia proponantur linguâ vulgari, quæ eo in loco ab hominibus in cœtu intelligatur. Confes. Helvet. cap. 22.

‡ Contra expressum spiritus sancti præceptum, in eâ omnia dicuntur et canuntur linguâ, quam populus non intelligit. Confes. Argentinens. cap. 21.

lawful for the sake of the learned sometimes to use a strange tongue, yet the consent of the universal church requires [proves this] that the necessary services of the church should be done in the mother tongue.”*

“Our [ministers] use all diligent endeavours that they may teach in the church and preach the word of the gospel, without mixture of human traditions; wherefore they read the very gospels and other Scriptures in the churches in the vulgar tongue, and afterwards interpret them to the people.”†

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning public religious worship in a known tongue.

“Although the mass contains much instruction of the people, yet the fathers thought it not expedient that it should be every where celebrated in the vulgar tongue.”‡

* Quod jam dictum est de usu linguæ vulgo notæ, intelligendum est non tantum de cantu psalmorum, sed etiam de omnibus partibus ecclesiastici ministerii. Sicut enim conciones et precationes linguâ ecclesiæ notâ habendæ sunt, ita et sacramenta noto sermone dispensanda sunt. Etsi enim licebit aliquoties peregrinâ linguâ propter studiosos uti, tamen consensus catholicæ ecclesiæ hoc exigit, ut necessaria ministeria ecclesiæ fiant sermone vernaculo. Confes. Wittemb. de horis Canon.

† Nostri omnem operam navant, ut verbum evangelii, permixtum humanis traditionibus in ecclesia doceant ac prædicent; proinde ipsa evangelia, nec non alias Scripturas, linguâ vulgari in templis legunt; ac ita demum populo interpretantur. Confes. Bohemic. artic. 10.

‡ Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem: non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim linguâ celebraretur. Concil. Trident. Ses. 22.

“Experience teaching us, we have learned, what has been the fruit of this, that divine service is performed in many places, translated into the mother tongue. So far from piety being increased, it is much diminished thereby.”*

The Rhemist divines on 1 Cor. 14, say: “We do not doubt but it is acceptable to God, and available in all necessities, and more agreeable to the use of all Christian people ever since their conversion, to pray in Latin, than in the vulgar, though every one in particular understands not what he saith: so it is plain that such pray with as great consolation of spirit, with as little tediousness, with as great devotion and affection, and sometimes more than the other, [such of their own church as learn their paternoster in their vulgar tongue,] and always more than any schismatic or heretic [protestant] in his own language. There is a reverence and majesty in the church’s tongue dedicated in our Saviour’s cross, which giveth more force and value to them [prayers] said in the church’s obedience, than to others. The special use of them [prayers] is to offer our hearts’ desires and wants to God, and to show that we hang on him in all things, and this every catholic doth for his condition, whether he

* *Exporientiâ magistrâ didicimus quid fructus ea res attulerit, quod in plerisque locis officia divina, in linguam vernaculam ad verbum translata decantentur. Tantum abest, ut accesserit ad pietatem aliquid plus, ut etiam diminutum esse videatur. Hosius de Sacro vernaculè legendo.*

understand the words of his prayer or not. It is enough that they can tell this holy orison to be appointed to us, to call upon God in all our desires; more than this is not necessary; and the translation of such holy things often breedeth manifold danger and irreverence in the vulgar (as to think God is the author of sin, when they read, Lead us not into temptation) and seldom any edification at all. To conclude, for praying either publicly or privately in Latin, which is the common sacred tongue of the greatest part of the Christian world, this is thought by the wisest and godliest to be most expedient, and is certainly seen to be nothing repugnant to St. Paul."

Reader, view over again 1 Cor. 14, and wonder at this popish insolence, to say, "this is nothing repugnant to St. Paul."

IV. *Of the Authority of the Scripture.*

1. The doctrine of the apostles concerning the authority of the Scripture, that it does not depend upon the testimony of men.

2 Pet. i. 19. "We have also a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place." 21. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Tim. iii. 16. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." 1 John v. 9. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater." 1 Thes. ii. 13. "Ye received

the word of God which ye heard of us,—not as the word of men, but as it is in truth the word of God.”

2. The doctrine of the protestants, or reformed churches concerning the authority of the Scripture.

“The authority of Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the word of God.”*

“We believe without wavering all things which are contained in the Scriptures, not so much because the church allows and receives them for canonical, as because the Holy Ghost bears witness to our consciences that they come from God, whereof they have proof in themselves.”†

“We believe and confess that the canonical Scriptures of the prophets and apostles, of the Old and New Testament, are the true word of God, and have sufficient authority from themselves, and not from men; for God himself spake unto the fathers, prophets and apostles, and yet speaks unto us by the Holy Scriptures.”‡

* Assemb. Confess.

† Omnia quæ canonicis libris continentur, absque omni dubitatione credimus; idque non tam, quod ecclesia eos pro hujusmodi recipiat et approbet, quam imprimis quod spiritus sanctus in cordibus nostris testetur à Deo perfectos esse, probationemque ejus in seipsis habeant. Confess. Belg. artic. 5.

‡ Credimus et confitemur Scripturas canonicas sanctorum prophetarum et apostolorum utriusque testamenti ipsum verum

“We acknowledge these books to be canonical, that is, we receive them as the rule of our faith, and that not only from the common consent of the church, but much rather from the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit.”*

“As we believe and confess that the word of God sufficiently instructs, and makes the man of God perfect; so we affirm and freely profess, that its authority is from God, and does not depend upon men or angels. We therefore assert, that they who say, the Scripture has no other authority but what it receives from the church, are blasphemers against God, and wrong the true church, which always hears and obeys the voice of her bridegroom and pastor, but never challenges to herself a power to be the mistress over it.”†

esse verbum Dei: et auctoritatem sufficientem ex semetipsis, non ex hominibus habere. Nam deus ipse loquutus est patribus, prophetis et apostolis, et loquitur adhuc nobis per Scripturas sanctas. Confess. Helvet. cap. 1.

* Hos libros agnoscimus esse canonicos, id est, ut fidei nostræ normam et regulam habemus; idque non tantum ex communi ecclesiæ consensu, sed etiam multo magis ex testimonio, et intrinsecâ spiritûs sancti persuasione. Confess. Gallic. art. 4.

† Sicut credimus et confitemur Scripturas Dei sufficienter instruere, et hominem Dei perfectum reddere, ita ejus auctoritatem à Deo esse, et nec ab homine vel angelo pendere affirmamus et profiteamur. Asserimus itaque quod qui dicunt Scripturam non aliam habere auctoritatem, sed eam quam ab ecclesia accepit, sunt in Deum blasphemi, et veræ ecclesiæ injuriam faciunt, quæ semper audit, et voci sponsi et pastoris sui obsequitur, nunquam autem magistram agere sibi arrogat. Confess. Scotican. art. 19.

“Forasmuch as the Holy Scriptures were given and inspired by God himself, for this cause especially, that they might be understood of all, they are read in our churches in the vulgar tongue.”*

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning the authority of the Scripture.

Cardinal Hosius, president in the council of Trent, says, “To ask, whether more credit should be given to the Scripture or the church? is to ask, whether more credit should be given to the Holy Ghost, speaking by the mouth of the church, or to the Holy Ghost speaking in the Scripture by the writings of the prophets and apostles. The church is to be believed without the authority of the Scriptures. If authority be not granted to the testimony of the church, the writings of the evangelists would be of no authority.”†

Hermanus speaks most contemptuously of the Holy Scriptures inspired by the glorious God, saying, “When the authority of the church leaves the Scriptures, they then are of no more account than *Æsop’s Fables*.”

Pighius treads in the steps of the rest, concluding,

* Quòd à Deo ipso, sacræ Scripturæ traditæ et inspiratæ, hancque ob causam potissimùm, ut ab omnibus intelligantur, eas ecclesiis nostris, linguâ vulgari, [nostri omnes] legunt et recitant. Confess. Bohemic. art. 1.

† Creditum est ecclesiæ sine omni Scripturarum præsidio. Testimonio ecclesiæ si non sua tribuetur autôritas, nulla erit eorum, quæ scripta sunt ab evangelistis, autoritas. Hosius Confess. Fid. Cath. cap. 15.

“That all the authority which the Scripture has with us, depends of necessity on the church.”*

And so does Canus, asserting, “That we are not bound to take the Scriptures for Scripture without the authority of the church.”† And so do many more, whose sayings we have not room to insert.

V. *Of the Judge of Controversies and Expounding Scriptures.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles concerning the judge of controversies and expounding Scriptures.

Mat. xxii. 29, 31, 32. “Jesus answered and said unto them (in the controversy about the resurrection) ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not READ that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham,” &c. Acts xviii. 28. “For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ.” Acts xvii. 2, 3. “And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus whom I preach

* Pigh. de Hierar. Lib. 1. cap. 2.

† Melch. Canus. Loc. Com. lib. 2. cap. 8.

unto you is the Christ." See Acts xxvi. 22, and xiii. 33.

The apostle teaches that the Scripture must not be expounded according to any private interpretation, 1 Pet. i. 20; and such is any exposition that is not according to the analogy of faith, which must be carefully heeded in Scripture interpretation, according to the apostle's doctrine, Rom. xii. 6.

2. The doctrine of the protestants and reformed churches concerning the judge of controversies and expounding Scripture.

"The Supreme Judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men and private spirits are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."*

"We hold no other judge in matters of faith than God himself, declaring by the Holy Scriptures what is true, and what is false; what ought to be embraced, and what to be avoided."†

"The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself, and therefore when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture, it must be searched and known by other places of Scripture that speak more clearly."‡

"We acknowledge that interpretation of Scrip-

* Assemb. Confess.

† Confess. Helvet. cap. 2.

‡ Assemb. Confess.

ture only to be orthodox and genuine, which is fetched from the Scriptures themselves.”* So other churches in their confessions.†

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning the judge of controversies and expounding Scripture.

The council of Trent decreed, “That none should interpret the Holy Scripture contrary to the meaning which the holy mother-church (to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of Scripture) has held and does hold.‡

“Forasmuch as the holy church of Rome is set up to the whole world for a glass or example, whatsoever she determines or ordains, ought by all perpetually and invincibly to be observed.”§ So their canon law.

Others of them to the same purpose: “All power to interpret Scripture, and reveal the hidden mysteries of our religion, is given from heaven to the popes and their councils. We are bound to stand to the judgment of the pope, rather than to the judgment of all the world besides.”

“We do constantly avouch all the popes that are rightly elected to be Christ’s vicars; and to have

* Confess. Scotican. art. 18. de notis Ecclesiæ.

† Confess. Helvet. cap. 2. Confess. Wittemberg. de Sacra Scriptura, et de Ecclesia.

‡ Nemo Sacras Scripturas contra eum sensum, quem tenuit, et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum—interpretari audeat. Concil. Trid. Ses. 4.

§ Corpus jur. Can. Dist. 19. c. enimvero.

the highest power in the catholic church, and that we are bound to obey him in all things pertaining to faith and religion. All catholic men must necessarily submit their judgment and opinions, either in expounding the Scripture, or otherwise, to the censure of the apostolic seat; and God has bound his church to hear the chief pastor in all points." [Thus Andradius, Alvarus Pelagius, Simancha.]

Bellarmin sticks so close to the judgment of the pope, that he might as well say, That if the pope say that black is white, or white black, that darkness is light, or that light is darkness, we must believe it, because his infallible holiness says it, as say what he does in these words; "If the pope should err in commanding vices and forbidding virtues, the church would be bound to believe, that vices are good, and virtues evil, unless she would sin against conscience."*

Is not this a notable saying, spoken like a cardinal?

Stapleton, advancing the judgment of the church, speaks resolvedly; "I have said, and do say, that Scripture, in itself, is not so much the rule of faith, as the faith of the church is the rule of Scripture."†

And Gregory of Valence puts in his saying for

* To prove the pope cannot err, he uses this argument. Si autem papa erraret præcipiendo vitia, prohibendo virtutes, tåneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona, et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare.—Bell. de Pont. lib. 4. cap. 5.

† Staplet. de Autorit. Scrip. lib. 2. cap. 11.

the pope's judgment. "In the Roman bishop resides that full authority of the church, when he pleases to determine matters of faith, whether he does it with a council, or without."*

Yea, the canon law sets him up for such an uncontrollable judge, "that if the pope, by his negligence or remissness in his work, be found unprofitable to himself or others; or if he should draw with him innumerable souls by heaps or troops to hell, yet might no mortal man be so bold or presumptuous as to reprove him, because he is the judge of all, to be judged by none."†

VI. *Of the Head of the Universal Church.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles, concerning the head of the universal church.

Matt. xxiii. 8. "But be not ye called rabbi, for one is your master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." Ephesians i. 22, 23. "And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Ephes. v. 23. "Christ is the head of the church, and he is the saviour of the body." Col. i. 18. "And he (Christ) is the head of the body, the church." 1 Cor. xii. 28. "And God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," &c.

* Gregor. de Valent. *Analys. fidei*, lib. 8. c. 1.

† *Corpus Juris Can. Distinct.* 40. *Si Papa*, &c.

Ephes. iv. 11. "And he gave some apostles, and some pastors and teachers."

Reader, observe, in these places where the apostle gives an enumeration of church officers, there is no mention of a vicar of Christ, or of any mortal man being the head under Christ, of all the churches of Christ in the world; and is it likely that he would have omitted the chiefest and most principal officer, that is essential to the church, if there had been any such? I can find several officers mentioned, but no universal (though secondary) head. I do not find a pope mentioned in the apostle's catalogue, either expressly or reductively; not expressly, that is plain; not reductively, for to which of these should he be reduced? To the prophets? let me hear his prophecies, and when any of them have been fulfilled. Besides, I know not that he pretends to it. To be an apostle? Apostles went up and down to preach the gospel, and were not fixed to any particular state, which is not the case of the bishop of Rome. To the number of teachers, and pastors? This is below the pope to be ranked amongst such, for he is the pastor of pastors. Besides, in the catalogue, there are many pastors, but I see not one to be the chief and head of all the rest, and of the whole universal church.

2. The doctrine of the protestants, or reformed churches, concerning the head of the universal church.

"There is no other head of the church, but the

Lord Jesus Christ, nor can the pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof. All true pastors, in what place soever they are placed, have the same and equal authority among themselves, given to them under Jesus Christ, the only head, and the chief, and alone universal bishop. And therefore, it is not lawful for any church to challenge to itself, dominion or sovereignty over any other church. The bishop of Rome has no more jurisdiction over the church of God, than the rest of the patriarchs, either of Alexandria or Antioch have.”

To this doctrine,* subscribe the churches of Helvetia, Scotland, Belgia, Wittemberg, Bohemia, &c.

3. The doctrine of the papists, concerning the head of the church.

“The canon law makes the church of Rome higher than all others by the head, affirming the church of Rome to be the head and prince of all nations; the mother of faith; that it had this headship not from the apostles, but from the Lord himself, and has the eminency of power over the universal church, and the whole flock of Christian people; the hinge and head of all churches; as the door turns upon the hinges, so all churches by God’s appointment, are governed by the authority of this holy seat; the first of all other seats, without spot or blemish, or any such thing. The mistress of all

* Confess. Helvet. cap. 17. Confess. Scoticana art. 16. de Ecclesia. Confessio Belgic. art. 29. Confess. Wittemb. de summo Pontifice. Confess. Bohemic. art. 8.

other churches, a glass and spectacle to all men, to be followed in all things which she appoints; against which church of Rome, whosoever speaks any evil, or endeavours to take away her privilege, is forthwith a heretic; and whoso shall refuse obedience to the apostolic seat, is an idolater, a witch, and pagan.”*

Reader, these are high and swelling words.

The Roman Catechism† propounds the question, “What are we to think of the bishop of Rome?” and answers, “the account and unanimous opinion of all the fathers, concerning him was, that this visible head was necessary to the constituting and preserving of the unity of the church.”

Bellarmin lays down this assertion: “The pope is immediately appointed by Christ, the pastor and head, not only of all particular churches, but also of the whole universal church taken together.”‡

VII. *Of Infallibility.*

1. The doctrine of the apostles, concerning the fallibility of churches and pastors.

1 Cor. xiii. 12. “For now we see through a glass darkly. Now I know but in part.” Gal ii. 11.

* Corpus Juris Can. Decret. part. 2. q. 7. cap. Beati. distinct. 22. c. Romana ecclesia cæterarum primatum habet. et glos. distinct. 22. c. Non. et glos. Sacrosancta. distin. 21. c. quamvis. ibid. c. denique; distinct. 19. c. enimvero. distin. 22. c. omnes. distin. 81. P. Greg. 7. c. si qui.

† Catechis. Trident in Expos. Symb. Apost.

‡ Bellarm. de Concil. Autorit. lib. 2. cap. 15.

“But when I came to Antioch I withstood him (Peter, the pope’s pretended predecessor) because he was to be blamed,” (and yet his successor must not be blamed, though through his negligence he should draw many to hell, as before is shown.) Ver. 12. “For before that certain came from James, he (Peter) did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.” V. 14. “But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all,” &c. Let the reader observe that the successor so called, claims a greater privilege than his supposed predecessor had, for Peter erred, but the pope (forsooth) cannot. Rom. xi. 18—21, turn to it. Ver. 22. “Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God; on them (the church of the Jews) which fell severity; but towards thee (the gentile and church of Rome amongst them) goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; (as she hath not) otherwise thou shalt be cut off.” (Where then is her infallibility?) Revel. xviii. 2. “Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, (and yet boasts she is without spot) and a cage of every unclean and hurtful bird;” (and yet is the holy mother church.) Read also in the second and third chapters of the Revelation, what is said of the seven churches; and then look for good proof that infallibility is settled by Christ upon the church

of Rome, above all other churches, before you believe any such privilege to be granted to it.

2. The doctrine of the protestants and reformed churches concerning the fallibility of churches.

“As the churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred; so also the church of Rome hath erred; not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith.* When general councils are gathered together (forasmuch as they are an assembly of men, whereof all are not governed with the Spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining unto God.”† Hereunto agree many other churches in their confessions.‡

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning infallibility of the church.

They teach that “the visible church whose rector is the pope of Rome, never has erred, never can err.”§

Bellarmin affirms,|| “1. That the pope, when he teaches the whole church, can in no case err in things appertaining to faith.” “2. Not only the pope of Rome, but the particular church of Rome

* Church of Engl. art. 19.

† Art. 21.

‡ Confes. Helvet. de Ecclesia. Confes. Saxon. de Eccles. Confes. Wittemberg de Conciliis.

§ Catechis. Trident. in Expos. Symb. Apost. de Eccles. q. 15. Test. Rhemist. Annot. on 1 Tim. i. 15, et Ephes. v. 24.

|| Bell. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 4. cap. 3.

cannot err in faith.”* “3. The pope of Rome cannot err, not only in decrees of faith, but also not in precepts of manners, which are prescribed to the whole church, and are necessary to salvation, or in those things which in themselves are good or evil.”† “4. It is probably and piously to be believed, that the pope not only as pope, cannot err, but as a particular person cannot be a heretic, by pertinaciously believing any thing that is false, contrary to the faith.”‡ (This is a foul mistake, for several popes have been heretics in the judgments of some of their popes, so that some of them must needs err; either some of them in being heretics, or others of them in saying they were, if they were not.) “5. Our opinion is, that the church cannot absolutely err, either in things absolutely necessary, or in other things, which she propounds to be believed or done by us, whether they be expressly contained in the Scriptures, or not.”§ “6. In these two things, all catholics agree; 1. That the pope, with his general council, cannot err in making decrees of faith, or general precepts of manners. 2. That the pope alone, or with his particular council determining any thing in a doubtful matter, whether he may err or not, ought to be obeyed by all the faithful.”|| [A goodly agreement!]

* Bell. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 4 cap. 4.

† Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 5.

‡ Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 6. °

§ Idem. de Eccles. Milit. lib. 3. cap. 14.

|| Idem. de Rom. Pont. lib. 4. cap. 2.

Becanus gives the opinion of the papists, saying,
 1. "That the church is the judge of controversies.
 2. That the rule by which the church determines controversies, or gives its definitive sentences, is not the Scripture only, but the Scripture and tradition together. 3. That the church according to the rule (of Scripture and tradition) pronounces sentence either by the pope, the pastor of the church, or by a council approved by the pope, and both ways infallibly."*

Pighius also puts in his judgment, "That the pope cannot any way be a heretic, nor publicly teach heresy, though he alone determine any matter."†

But reader, notwithstanding all this confidence of infallibility whether of pope, or councils, or both, they are proved to have erred, from the historical narratives of their own writers. Baronius acknowledges that pope Honorius‡ was counted a heretic, joining with the Monothelites, or those that denied two wills in Christ; and so do their own Genebrard,§ and the Rhemists, though some of them go one way, and some another to save the infallibility, yet in vain; for he was condemned by|| a general

* *Catholici tria docent, &c.* Becan. *Manual.* lib. 1. cap. 5.

† *Pigh.* lib. 4. *Hier. Eccl.* cap. 8.

‡ *Spondan. Epitom.* Baro. par. 2. p. 96.

§ *Genebr. Chron.* lib. 3. pag. 484.

|| *Concil. Constantinople,* 6 Act. 13. *Sur. Tom.* 2. p. 992. *Caranz. Sum. Concil.* p. 591, 610, 612.

council, and anathematized, with six more holding the same heresy, and this when the legates of pope Agatho were present; whose epistles to Sergius, &c. were produced and read in the council, and judged heretical, destructive to men's souls and condemned to be presently burnt, and so they were.

Their own Baronius also gives an account of the barbarous actings of pope Stephen* the Seventh, (called the Sixth) towards the dead body of Formosus, his predecessor; for taking it out of the sepulchre, he set it clothed in its pontificals in the pontifical seat, and after he had derided it, took off its vestments, and cut off three fingers, and cast it into the river Tiber; and all whom Formosus had ordained, he degraded and ordained them again. "This pope (says the author), gathering a synod, approved his inhuman act, which was condemned again by pope John IX., as he had made void the decrees of Formosus." And thus they can decree, and others rescind and decree the contrary, and act worse than heathens, and yet not err any of them, in faith or manners, which to any man's reason seems very strange.

Besides, Marcellinus† was an idolater; Liberius‡

* Ita furore percitus homo non quod jure liceret, sed quod exæstuans rabies suaderet, implens. Spondan. Epitom. Baron. par. 2. p. 247.

† Ipse Marcellinus ad sacrificium ductus est, ut sacrificaret, quod et fecit. Caranz. Concil. p. 72.

‡ Liberium tædio victum exilii, in hæreticam pravitatem subscripsisse, asserit Hieronimus: testantur id ipsum alii quoque antiqui Scriptores; ac denique ipse Liberius scriptis literis ad, &c. Spondan. Epitom. Baron. in Ann. 357.

an Arian; Siricius, Calixtus, Leo IX. and Paschalis condemned ministers' marriage. John XXII. held, that the souls of the wicked should not be punished till the day of judgment. John XXIII. denied the soul's immortality. John XI. kept for his paramour a famous strumpet called Marozia. John XIII. at dice called to the devil for help, and drank a health to him; lay with his own mother, and his father's concubine; ordained deacons in a stable; for money made boys bishops; committed incest with two of his sisters; and at last being found in the act of adultery, was slain by the woman's husband.

Pope Sylvester II.* was a conjuror. Enquiring of the devil how long he should live, he was answered, till he should say mass in Jerusalem; in the lent after, as he was saying mass in the chapel of Saint Cross, he suddenly fell sick, and remembering that that chapel was called Jerusalem, he perceived how he was cozened by the devil. Before he died, he bequeathed his soul to the devil, and commanded his cardinals, that after his death they should cut his body in pieces and so bury him. Pope Hildebrand† was a conjuror, and enquiring of

* Sylvestrum secundum, Benedictum 9. Gregorium 6. Gregorium 7. fuisse magos, narrat Beno cardinalis. Sylvester 2. inter ipsas mortis angustias supplicat, manus et linguam sibi abscindi, per quas sacrificando demonibus, deum inhonoravit.

† Hildebrandus, (qui Gregorius 7.) consecratam eucharistiam in ignem projecit, consulens dæmones contra Henricum 4.

the host (which they say is the body of Christ,) for an answer against the emperor, because it would not speak, he threw it into the fire and burnt it. For many wickednesses he was deposed and banished. Pope Leo X. pleased with the great sums of money which he had got by indulgences, said to cardinal Bembas, "see what abundance of wealth we have gotten by this fable of Christianity." And when he lay upon his death-bed, the same cardinal rehearsing a text of Scripture to him, he replied, "away with these fables concerning Christ." Pope Nicolas I. forbade marriage to the clergy; saying, it was more honest to have to do with many women privately, than openly to take one wife. John XXIV. was accused before the council of Constance for heresy, simony, murder, poisonings, adulteries, and sodomy; which being made good against him, he was deposed and imprisoned. Pope Eugenius IV.* was deposed by the general council at Basil, for being a simonist, and guilty of perjury, being a schismatic, and an obstinate heretic. It would make a large book to give an account of the failings of popes in matters both of life and faith; but I have but little room allowed. Take two general expressions of their own

imp. Beno cardinalis, qui et plura de hoc et aliis Romanis pontif. miranda narrat, quæ nullus historicorum neque Platina, nec quisquam alius prodidit. Vide Illyric. Catal. pag. 219, 220, 221, 223, &c.

* Laurent. Suri. Concil. tom. 4. pag. 104.

authors and then judge. “What then was the face of the holy Roman church? How exceeding filthy, when the most potent, and yet the most sordid strumpets ruled at Rome? and their lovers thrust in Peter’s chair?”* Another fixed enough to the popish religion, acknowledged that in this one thing that age was unhappy, that for near one hundred and fifty years about fifty popes wholly fell away from the virtue of their ancestors, being rather apotactical [irregular] and apostatical than apostolical.†

And as the church (if thereby understood the pope) has failed, so also if taken for general councils has also failed, as is plain by this infallible argument, in that several general councils ratified by popes have decreed things contradictory, and that in matters of faith; and some of them must necessarily err, except contradictions can be reconciled,

* Vide. Luitprand. lib. 2. c. 13. et Baron. Annal. ad an. 912. vel Spondan. Ex quibus videas fœdissimam hujus temporis ecclesiæ Romanæ faciem, ad an. 912.

† Genebrar. in seculum decimum. Infelix dicitur hoc seculum, exhaustum hominibus ingenio et doctrina claris, sive etiam claris principibus et pontificibus, in quo nihil fere dignum memoria posteritatis gestum sit. Hoc ipso infelicissimum, quod ecclesia esset, sine ullo bono fere pontifice. Hoc vero uno infelix, quod per annos fere 150, pontifices circiter 50, à Johanne scilicet 8, qui Nicolao, et Adriano 2, sanctis successit, ad Leonem 9, usque à virtute majorum prorsus defecerint, apotactici, apostaticè potius quam apostolici, e tanto pontificum numero, quinque modo, et satis tenuiter, laudantur, &c. Genebrard. Chronol. lib. 4. pag. 552, 553.

and both parts be true, which is impossible. For example, the general councils of Constance and of Basil have fully asserted that a general council is above the pope, who is to be judged by them, and by them may be deposed; in these words, "Not one of the skilful ever doubted but that the pope was subject to the judgment of a general council, in things that concern faith; and that he cannot without their consent dissolve or remove a general council; yea and that this is an article of faith, which without destruction of salvation cannot be denied, and that the council is above the pope, *de fide*, and that it cannot be removed without their own consent, and that he is a heretic that is against these things." Thus the council of Basil owned by pope Eugenius, and the council of Constance* confirmed

* *Primo definitur quod generalis synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, generale concilium faciens, ecclesiam militantem repræsentans, potestatem à Christo immediatè habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque status, etiam si papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quæ pertinent ad fidem et ad extirpationem schismatum, et ad generalem reformationem ecclesiæ in capite et in membris. Secundò, declarat quod, quicumque cujuscunque dignitatis, et etiam si papalis existat, qui mandatis aut præceptis hujus sanctæ synodi, et cujuscunque alterius concilii generalis obedire contumaciter contempserit, nisi resipuerit, condignæ pœnitentiæ subjiciatur et debite puniatur. Tertiò, declarat quod ipsum generale concilium pro præmissis, eaque concernentibus congregatum sine ipsius consensu, per nullum, quavis autoritate, etiam si papali dignitate præfulgeat, dissolvi, transferri, aut ad aliud tempus prorogari potest. Hæc tria sunt veritates fidei catholicæ, quibus pertinaciter repugnans est censendus hæreticus.*

by pope Martin V. being personally present in it. And yet another general council* at the Lateran under Julius II. and Leo X., expressly decree on the contrary, that the pope is above a general council; till these two can both be true, the pope *is* above a general council, and the pope *is not* above a general council, the infallibility of their church (and that even in a fundamental point thereof) is laid in the dust.

VIII. *Of the Catholic Church.*

1. The doctrine of the apostles concerning the catholic or universal church.

1 Cor. i. 2. "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." 1 Cor. xii. 13. "For by one spirit, we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink into one spirit." Rev. vii. 9. "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and

* Cum etiam solum Romanum pontificem, pro tempore existentem, tanquam auctoritatem super omnia concilia habentem, conciliorum indicendorum, transferendorum ac dissolvendorum plenum jus et potestatem habere, ex conciliorum confessione manifeste constet. Laurent. Surius, Concil. tom. 4. pag. 683. There was but one in all the council, but gave his placet hereunto, that would not recede from the determination of the council of Basil. Ibid. pag. 684.

before the Lamb." See also Ephes. i. 10, 22. Acts ii. 39. Ephes. ii. 19. and iii. 15. Acts ii. 47. Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15. Acts ii. 21. Rom. i. 16. Gal. iii. 28. Acts xiii. 39. Rom. x. 4. Luke xiii. 28. Acts x. 35.

Reader, observe that these Scriptures speak of the church, under Christ her head, making no mention of acknowledging, or being joined to, any mortal man, as her visible head; in which church, not limited or confined to the church of Rome, there is salvation.

2. The doctrine of the protestants concerning the catholic or universal church.

"The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof, and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

"The visible church, which is also catholic or universal, under the gospel, (not confined to one nation, as before under the law) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

This is the confession also of the churches of Helvetia, Bohemia, Belgia, Wittemberg, &c.*

* Conf. Gall. art. 27, 28: Conf. Helvet. 2. cap. 17: Bohem. c. 8: Belg. art. 27: Wittemb. art. 32.

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning the catholic or universal church.

The Trent catechism* makes that to be the only church, which is under the pope, excluding all others that submit not to him as the vicar of Christ; the Lateran council made it necessary to salvation, to be subject to the pope of Rome: Pope Pius II. approved this doctrine: "I came to the fountain of truth, which the holy doctors, with one voice, say, that he cannot be saved that holds not the unity of the holy church of Rome; and that all those virtues are maimed to him that refuses to obey the pope of Rome, though he lie in sackcloth and ashes, and fast and pray both day and night, and seem in other things to fulfil the law of God. We learned that the one catholic and apostolical church (of Rome) is the mother of all the faithful, out of which there is no salvation."†

But reader, do you think that God will damn any holy, humble and believing persons, because they are not subject to the pope? Has God any where

* Catechis. Rom. in Symb. page 139, 141.

† Ad fontem veri perveni.—Quem sancti doctores, quorum una vox est, salvari non posse, qui sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem; omnesque illas virtutes mancas esse ei, qui summo pontifici obedire recusat; quamvis in sacco et cinere jacens, dies et noctes jejundet, et oret, et in cæteris videatur legem implere,—didicimus unam ecclesiam catholicam et apostolicam esse matrem omnium fidelium, extra quam non invenitur salus.—Pius II. Bul. Retractationum apud Laurent. Surium, Concil. tom. 4, pag. 506.

made such subjection to him a condition of salvation? Let them show it if they can. Or are there no such persons in the world that are holy and believing, and yet do not submit to the pope? There are many thousands that know themselves better than his infallible holiness can know them, who know that to be a falsehood.

Nor does Bellarmin vary from them in his definition of the church: "That it is a company of men knit together in the profession of the same Christian faith, and communion of the same sacraments, under the government of lawful pastors, especially of the bishop of Rome, Christ's vicar upon earth. From whence it might be easily gathered, who belong to the church, and who do not. There are three parts of this definition of the church. 1. Profession of the true faith. 2. Communion of the sacraments. 3. Subjection to the pope of Rome, the lawful pastor. By the first, all infidels, Turks, pagans, heretics and apostates are excluded from the church. By the second, catechumens and excommunicated persons are excluded. By the third, all schismatics that have the word and sacraments, but do not submit to the lawful pastor (the pope); but all others though they be reprobates, wicked and ungodly, are included in the church."*

Mark this, good reader, whether this sounds like the apostle's doctrine before laid down. If men be

* Bellar. de Eccles. Milit. lib. 3. cap. 2.

never so good, and holy, though converted, and believing, if they do not submit to the pope as the universal head, they are no members of Christ's church, nor can be saved; and if they be wicked and ungodly, if they own the pope they are included in the church. Oh what an odious religion is that, which damns all the Christians in the world besides themselves! O what wretched dissembling is this, to call their church the most holy church, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing; when the worst might be and are owned as members thereof, if they profess subjection to the pope!

IX. *Of Justification.*

1. The doctrine of the apostles concerning justification.

Rom. iv. 5—8. "Now to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." 2 Cor. v. 19, 21. "Not imputing their trespasses unto them. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Rom. iii. 22, 24. "Even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto all, and upon all them that believe.

Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus." See ver. 25, 28; and Tit. iii. 5, 7; Rom. v. 17, 18, 19; Gal. ii. 16; Phil. iii. 9; Acts xiii. 38, 39; Ephes. ii. 8, 9.

2. The doctrine of the protestants concerning justification.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works and deservings.

"Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone. Imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him, and his righteousness by faith, which faith they have, not of themselves, it is the gift of God."

To this doctrine consent the reformed churches in Helvetia, Bohemia, France, Belgia, &c.*

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning justification.

"Justification is not only the forgiveness of sin, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inward man by a voluntary susception of grace and

* Confes. Helvet. 1. 4. 16. et 2. cap. 15. Bohemic. cap. 6. 7. Gal. art. 12. 22. August. art. 4. 6. 26. Belg. art. 22. 24. Wittemberg: art. 5. Basil art. 8.

gifts, whereby a man of unjust is made just, and of an enemy is made a friend, that he might be an heir according to the hope of eternal life. The only formal cause of justification is the righteousness of God, not wherewith he himself is righteous, but whereby he makes us righteous; namely, by which, being given to us by him, we are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and not only reputed, but are, and are truly called righteous, receiving righteousness in ourselves, every one according to his measure, which the Holy Spirit imparteth to each, as he will, according to every one's own disposition, and co-working. If any one shall say that a man is justified by the sole imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or in the sole remission of sin, excluding grace and charity, which is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Spirit, and is inherent in him, or that the grace whereby we are justified is only the favour of God, let him be accursed.”*

Reader, by this council you may see, how the papists confound justification and sanctification, and

* *Justificatio non est sola peccatorum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiæ et donorum, &c. unica formalis causa ejus est justitia Dei, &c. qua videlicet, ab eo donati, renovamur spiritu mentis nostræ, &c. Si quis dixerit homines justificari vel solâ imputatione justitiæ Christi, vel solâ peccatorum remissione, exclusâ gratiâ, et charitate, quæ in cordibus eorum per Spiritum Sanctum diffundatur, atque illis inhæreat, aut etiam gratiam quâ justificamur, esse tantum favorem Dei, anathema sit. Concil. Trident. Sess. 6.*

place it in our inherent righteousness. Though these are not separated, that any should be justified who is not sanctified, penitent, and believing, yet they are carefully to be distinguished.

X. *Of the Merit of Good Works.*

1. The doctrine of prophets, Christ, and his apostles.

Isaiah lxiv. 6. "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." Job xxii. 2, 3. "Can a man be profitable unto God? Is it any gain to him that thou makest thy way perfect?" Job xxxv. 7. "If thou be righteous, what givest thou unto him, or what receiveth he of thy hand?" Luke xvii. 10. "We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which was our duty to do." Romans viii. 18. "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us." Also Psalm cxxx. 3, and cxliii. 2; Romans iv. 2, 4, 5, 6; 1 Corinthians iv. 7; Ephesians ii. 9.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

"We cannot, by our best works, merit pardon of sin, or eternal life at the hand of God, by reason of the great disproportion that is between them and the glory to come, and the infinite distance that there is between us and God, whom, by them, we can neither profit nor satisfy for the debt of our former sins; but, when we have done all we can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable ser-

vants; and because, as good, they proceed from his Spirit, yet as they are wrought by us, they are defiled and mixed with so much weakness and imperfection, that they cannot endure the severity of God's judgment." To this doctrine, the reformed churches subscribe.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

"If any one shall say, that the good works of a justified person are so the gifts of God, that they may not also be the good merits of him that is justified; or that he that is justified, does not, by the good works which he does, by the grace of God and merit of Christ (of whom he is a living member), truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and (if he depart in a state of grace), the enjoyment thereof, and moreover also increase of glory, let him be accursed."†

"Men's works, proceeding from grace, deserve or merit heaven.—If the joy of heaven be retribution, repayment, hire-wages for works, then works can be no other but the value, desert, price, worth and merit of the same.—The word reward in Latin

* Confess. Wittemb. de bonis operibus. Bohem. art. 7. Saxon. art. 3. et 8. August. art. 4. et 20. Helvet. 2. c. 16. Belg. art. 24. Argentinens. cap. 10.

† Si quis dixerit hominis justificati bona opera ita esse dona Dei, ut non sint etiam bona ipsius justificati merita, aut ipsum justificatum bonis operibus, &c. non vere mereri augmentum gratiæ vitam æternam et ipsius vitæ æternæ, &c. consecutionem, atque etiam gloriæ augmentum, anathema sit. Concil. Trid. Sess. 6.

or Greek is the very stipend that the hired workman or journeyman covenants to have of him whose work he does, and is a thing equally and justly answering to the time and weight of his travails and works, rather than a free gift,* &c. It is most clear to all not blinded in pride and contention, that good works are meritorious, and the very cause of salvation.”†

“The heavenly blessedness which the Scripture calls the reward of the just, is not given of God gratis and freely, but is due to their works. Yea, God has set forth heaven to sale for our works.‡ Far be it from us that the righteous should look for eternal life, as a poor man does for his alms, for it is much more honour for them as victors and triumphers to possess it, as the garland which by their labour they have deserved.§ Although the restoration of mankind be ascribed to the merits of Christ, yet it is not for Christ’s merits that our works are rewarded with eternal life; neither does God, when he gives the reward, look towards Christ’s death, but only to the first institution of mankind, wherein by the law of nature it was appointed that in the just judgment of God, obedience should be rewarded with life, as disobedience is with death.”||

* Rhemists on 1 Cor. iii. 8.

† Rhem. on Heb. vi. 10.

‡ Andrad. Orth. Expl. 16.

§ Dean of Lovan Expli. art. Lovan. Tom 2. art. 9.

|| Bayus de Merit. Operum, lib. 1. c. 9.

“A supernatural work, proceeding from grace, within itself, and of its own nature, has a proportion and condignity with the reward, and a sufficient value to be worth the same. The reward therefore is not given for Christ’s merit. It must not be denied but our merits are true merits, so that the works of the godly, proceeding from grace, have of themselves an inward worthiness, and are proportionable to the reward,”* &c.

The papists in this point are not all of a mind, but many of them swell with horrible pride, and think they deserve heaven as well as a journeyman does his wages, and cannot be brought to stoop so low as to receive the highest happiness as the free gift of God.

XI. *Of Works of Supererogation.*

1. The doctrine of the Scripture.

Nehem. xiii. 22. “And I commanded the Levites that they should cleanse themselves.—Remember me, O my God, concerning this also, and spare me according to the greatness of thy mercies.” Luke xvii. 10. Gal. v. 17.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

“Voluntary works, besides, over and above God’s commandments, which they call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogance and im-

* Suarez. Tom. 1. in Tho. 3. d. 41. sect. 3. 5. ss. secundo, et oportet :

piety; for by them men declare that they not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required; whereas Christ says plainly, When ye have done all things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants."

Against such works are the reformed churches also in Helvetia, France, Saxony,* &c.

3. The doctrine of the papists.

"The fastings and satisfactory deeds of one man, are available to others; yea, and holy saints, and other virtuous persons may in measure and proportion of other men's necessities and deservings, allot to them, as well the supererogation of their spiritual works, as those that abound in worldly goods may give alms of their superfluities, to them which are in necessity."† Again, they expound 1 Cor. ix. 16. "But now preaching not only as enjoined me, but also as of love and charity, and freely without putting any man to cost, and that voluntarily and of very desire to save my hearers, I shall have my reward of God, yea, and a reward of supererogation, which is given to them who of abundant charity do more in the service of God than they are commanded."

But, reader, though a man might have more money than he needs, yet you will not find a man that has more grace than he needs; and he that cannot

* Confess. Helvet. 2. c. 16. August. art. 20. Gal. art. 24. Sax. art. 3. 17. Basil. art. 10. Belg. art. 12.

† Rhemists on 2 Cor. 8. 14.

satisfy for himself cannot impart satisfaction to another; for none can give what they have not; and if we do what is no way commanded, we might hear, Who hath required this at your hands? And though Paul was not burdensome to the Corinthians, yet he received from other churches to do them service. So that all that is said falls short to prove works of supererogation. Let proud papists boast of doing more, but let us go to our knees to lament, that when we have done our best, we have done less than is commanded.

XII. *Of Religious Worship.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles, is that religious worship is due only to God.

Mat. iv. 10. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Col. ii. 18. "Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels." Rev. xix. 10. "And I fell at his feet to worship him, and he said unto me, See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, worship God." See also Rev. xxii. 8, 9. Acts x. 25, 26. "As Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him and fell down at his feet and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up, I myself also am a man." Read also Acts xiv. 13—15, 18. Rom. x. 14.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

"Religious worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to him alone, and

not to angels, saints, or any other creature. The acceptable way of worshipping the true God, is instituted by himself, and so limited to his own revealed will, that he may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representations, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.”* In this, the reformed churches agree in their public confessions.

3. The doctrine of the papists concerning religious worship given to saints, and their relics, and to images.

“The holy synod of Trent commands all bishops and others, that have the office and care of teaching, that according to the use of the catholic and apostolical church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, according to the consent of the holy fathers, and decrees of sacred councils, [which yet have decreed against it], they first of all diligently instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and invocation of saints, the honour of relics, and the lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints reigning together with Christ, offer their prayers to God for men, and that it is good and profitable, humbly kneeling, to call upon them; and to run to their prayers, help, and aid, for the benefits to be obtained from God, through his son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and

* Confess. Helvet. c. 4, 5. Gall. art. 24. Belgic. art. 26. Argent c. 11. August. art. 21. Saxon. de Invocatione, &c.

Saviour; and that they are of a wicked opinion that say, that the saints, enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, are not to be called upon; or who affirm, either that they do not pray for men, or that to pray to them, that they would pray for us, yea, each one particularly, is idolatry, or contrary to the word of God, or against the honour of Jesus, the one Mediator of God and men; or that it is a foolish thing to make humble request in words, or in our own minds, to those that are reigning in heaven. Moreover, that the sacred bodies of the holy martyrs and others living with Christ, which were living members of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, which shall be raised by him to eternal life and be glorified, are to be worshipped by believers, by which God bestows many benefits on men. So that whosoever shall say, that veneration and honour is not due to the relics of the saints, or that these and other sacred monuments are without profit honoured [worshipped] by the faithful; and that for the gaining of their help, the memory of saints in vain is solemnized, are utterly to be condemned, even as the church has long condemned them, and does now condemn them. Moreover, the images of Christ, the Virgin Mary, and of other saints, are especially to be had and kept in churches, and due honour and veneration to be given to them.”*

* Mandat sancta synodus omnibus episcopis, et cæteris docendi munus curamque sustinentibus, ut juxta catholicæ et apostolicæ ecclesiæ usum, à primævis Christianæ religionis tem-

Again: "It is beyond all doubt, that believers, according to the custom always received in the catholic church, should give to the holy Sacrament, the worship of Latria (highest worship), which is due to the true God." Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. cap. 5.

The popish doctors maintain of images in general, that they ought to be worshipped with the same

poribus receptum, sanctorumque patrum consensionem et sanctorum conciliorum decreta, imprimis de sanctorum intercessionem, invocationem, reliquiarum honore et legitimo imaginum usu, fideles diligenter instruant, docentes eos, sanctos unâ cum Christo regnantes, orationes suas pro hominibus Deo offerre, bonum atque utile esse simpliciter eos invocare et ob beneficia impetranda à Deo per filium ejus, &c. ad eorum orationes, opem, auxiliumque confugere; illos vero qui negant sanctos æterna felicitate in cœlo fruantes, invocandos esse, aut qui asserunt, vel illos pro hominibus non orare, vel eorum, ut pro nobis etiam singulis orent, invocationem esse idololatriam, vel pugnare cum verbo Dei, adversarique honori unius Mediatoris Dei, et hominum Jesu Christi, vel stultum esse, in cœlo regnantibus voce, vel mente supplicare, impie sentire: sanctorum quoque martyrum, et aliorum cum Christo viventium sancta corpora quæ viva membra Christi fuerint, et templum spiritus sancti, ab ipso ad æternam vitam suscitanda, et glorificanda, à fidelibus veneranda esse, per quæ multa beneficia à Deo hominibus præstantur; ita ut affirmantes sanctorum reliquiis venerationem atque honorem non deberi, vel eas, aliaque sacra monumenta à fidelibus inutiliter honorari, atque eorum opis impetrandæ causâ sanctorum memorias frustra frequentari, damnandos esse, prout jampridem eos damnavit, et nunc etiam damnat ecclesia. Imagines porro Christi, deiparæ virginis et aliorum sanctorum, in templis præsertim habendas et retinendas, eisque debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam. Concil. Trident. Sess. 25.

adoration as the thing represented by the image. So Aquinas. The same reverence is given to the image of Christ, as to Christ himself. Since therefore Christ is worshipped with the adoration of Latria (highest worship due to God), it follows that his image ought to be worshipped with adoration of Latria (or highest worship due to God).

XIII. *Of Transubstantiation.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles is, that after consecration in the Lord's Supper, there is real bread and wine.

Matthew xxvi. 26, 27; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23—28. "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks—he took the cup, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood." Mark, reader, after the blessing it is called bread. "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup. Whosoever shall eat this bread. Examine—and eat of that bread." 1 Cor. x. 16. "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ." Acts xx. 7—11. "They came together to break bread. And had broken bread."

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

"Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine), in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthrow the nature of a Sacrament, and has given occasions

to many superstitions and idolatries, and is repugnant to sense and reason:" Which reasons have moved all the reformed churches against the doctrine of transubstantiation.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

"If any shall deny the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and so whole Christ to be truly, really and substantially contained in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist, (Lord's supper) but shall say, it is there only as in a sign, either figuratively or virtually, let him be accursed. If any shall say, that the substance of bread and wine, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, remains in the sacrament of the holy eucharist, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood (the figures of bread and wine only remaining) which conversion [change] the catholic church most fitly calls transubstantiation, let him be accursed."†

* Conf. Helv. 1. art. 22. et 2. c. 21. Wittem. c. 19. de Euchar. Basil. art. 6. Scotican. art. 21.

† Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimæ eucharistiæ sacramento contineri, verè, realiter, et substantialiter corpus et sanguinem, unà cum animâ et divinitate Christi, &c. Si quis dixerit in sacrosancto eucharistiæ sacramento remanere substantiam panis et vini, &c. negaveritque mirabilem illam et singularem conversionem totius substantiæ panis in corpus, et totius substantiæ vini in sanguinem, &c.—Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. Can. 1, 2.

XIV. *Of receiving both Kinds.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles, is that those that have the bread should also have the cup.

Mark xiv. 22—24. Luke xxii. 19, 20. 1 Cor. x. 16, and xi. 24—27, 29. “Take, eat—as oft as ye drink it—eat this bread, and drink this cup—shall eat this bread and drink this cup—so let him eat—and drink of this cup—for he that eateth and drinketh—”

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

“The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the laity, for both the parts of the Lord’s sacrament, by Christ’s ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.” That the people are to receive the wine also, is the confession of the reformed churches in Helvetia, Bohemia, France, &c.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

The council of Constance decreed, “That though Christ administered this sacrament, in both kinds, to his disciples, and, in the primitive church, it was also accordingly received by believers under both kinds [bread and wine,] hoc tamen non obstante, notwithstanding [Christ’s institution, and the

* Confes. Helv. 1. art. 22, et 2. c. 21. Bohem. c. 13. Gall. 36, 38. Wittemb. cap. 19. Belg. art. 35. Saxon. de cœna Domin. August. de missa, art. 1, 2.

example of the primitive church] the laity shall have the bread only. Others that pertinaciously affirm otherwise are to be expelled as heretics. Also we command, upon pain of excommunication, that no presbyter administer it to the people under both kinds of bread and wine.”* The council of Trent to the same purpose decreed the taking away the cup from the people, notwithstanding Christ’s institution, and administration of it in both kinds, “having a power to alter and change, so that they keep the substance of the sacrament, as they judge most profitable for the receivers;”† and though they confess the primitive church received both, yet the church of Rome, “for grand and just reasons has approved and decreed the people’s taking of it in one kind only.”

XV. *Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.*

1. The doctrine of the apostle Paul.

Heb. ix. 22, 25, 26, 28. “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission. Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; (for then must he have often suffered since the foundation of the world,) but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sins

* Concil. Constant. Sess. 13.

† Concil. Trident. Sess. 21. cap. 1, 2, 3.

by the sacrifice of himself. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. Heb. x. 11, 12, 14, 18. "And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins. But this man after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin. Read also Heb. vii. 23—27.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

"The offering of Christ once made, is, that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is no other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of masses, in the which it was commonly said that the priest offered Christ for the quick and dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits." This is the doctrine of all reformed churches against the sacrifice of the mass.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

"If any shall say that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, let him be accursed. If any shall say in those words, 'Do this

* Confes. Helvet. 1. art. 22. et 2. cap. 30, 21. Basil. art. 6. Saxon. art. 14. Belg. art. 35. Wittemb. c. 19. Bohem. c. 13. Augustan. de Missa, art. 13.

in remembrance of me,' Christ did not institute his apostles to be priests, or that he did not ordain, that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed."*

"If any shall say the sacrifice of mass is only of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and not a propitiatory sacrifice, or that it profits him alone that takes it, and ought not to be offered for quick and dead, for sins, punishments and satisfactions, and other necessities, let him be accursed."

So in that part of the mass called the offertory, the priest says, "Holy Father, eternal and almighty God, receive this immaculate host, which I, thine unworthy servant, offer unto thee my true and living God, for my innumerable sins, and offences and neglects, and for all them that stand here about, and also for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may profit me and them unto salvation, unto eternal life. Amen."

Again, in the mass-book the priest prays: "We

* Si quis dixerit, in missâ non offerri Deo verum et proprium sacrificium, anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, illis verbis, hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse apostolos sacerdotes; aut non ordinasse, ut, ipsi alique sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum, anathema sit. Si quis dixerit, missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actionis, &c. non autem propitiatorium; vel soli prodesse sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pœnis, satisfactionibus, et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, anathema sit.—Concil. Trident. Sess. 22. de Sacrific. Missæ, Can. 1, 2, 3.

beseech thee, therefore most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord, and do ask of thee that thou wilt accept, and bless these † gifts, these † presents, these hotly sacrifices immaculate, especially those which we offer unto thee for thy holy catholic church, and all them that assist here, for themselves and for all theirs, for the redemption of their souls, and for the hope of their salvation. Which oblation, thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to make blessed, † ascript, † reasonable † and acceptable; † that it may be made unto us the body and blood† of thy most beloved Son. We present to thy excellent Majesty of thy gifts and things given, a pure † host, a holy † host, an immaculate † host, the holy bread † of eternal life, and the cup † of eternal salvation. We humbly pray thee, almighty God, command that these things be carried by the hands of thy holy angels to thy altar on high, into the presence of thy divine Majesty, that we all who, by the participation of thine altar [kisses here the altar,] have taken the holy body and blood † of thy Son, may be filled with all heavenly blessings and grace.” And then the priest prays for the dead, “be mindful also, O Lord, of thy men servants, and women servants, [naming their names that are deceased, for whom friends or kindred would have mass,] who have preceded us with the sign of the faith, and who sleep in a sleep of peace.”

View and consider this little piece, which I have

transcribed, reader, out of the mass-book, and then judge whether there is any such thing concerning the Lord's supper in the Scripture; and whether these are not new doctrines and devices.

XVI. *Of Worshipping the Host.*

1. The doctrine of the Scripture concerning the Lord's supper, where it is treated of, contains nothing for the worshipping of it; as Matt. xxvi. 26, 27. Mark xiv. 22—24. 1 Cor. xi. 24—29.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

“The worshipping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about for adoration, and the reserving of them for any pretended religious use, are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.” So say other reformed churches in their public confessions of faith.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

“It is beyond all doubt that the faithful, according to the custom always received in the catholic church, may give in veneration the worship of Latria, which is due to the true God, to this holy sacrament; for it is not the less to be adored, because it was appointed by the Lord to be received; for we believe that the same God is present in it, whom the eternal father, bringing into the world, saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.”†

* Confess. Helvet. 2. c. 21. Saxo. de cœna dom. Wittemb. de Eucharist. Basil. art. 6.

† Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, quin omnes Christi

Moreover the holy synod declares* “That with very great religion and piety of the church was this custom brought in, that every year upon some peculiar holy-day, this high and venerable sacrament with singular veneration and solemnity should be celebrated, and that it should in processions, reverently with honour and worship be carried about through the ways and public places.”

XVII. *Of Auricular Confession.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles concerning confession of sin.

Luke xvii. 3, 4.—James v. 16.—1 John i. 9. See also Proverbs xxviii. 13. Psalms xxxii. 5, 6, and li. 4, 5, 7, 9, 14. In all which places there is confession of sin to God, to the party wronged by us, and to one another; but not a word of secret confession of all our sins in the ears of the priest.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

“As every man is bound to make private confession of his sins to God, praying for the pardon thereof, upon which and the forsaking of them he shall find mercy; so he that offends his brother, or the church of God, ought to be willing by a private or public confession and sorrow for his sin, to declare his repentance to those that are offended, who

fideles pro more in catholicâ ecclesiâ semper recepto, patriæ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione exhibeant, &c.

* Concil. Trident. Sess. 13. cap. 5.

are therefore to be reconciled, and in love to receive him." So other reformed churches.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

"Let every one, both men and women, truly make confession of all their sins, at least once a year, to their own priest, or some other, having leave first from their own priest, else he can neither absolve nor bind him."†

"The universal church to the great profit of souls keeps the custom of confession in that holy and most acceptable time of lent, which also this holy synod most highly approves and receives, as piously, and with good cause to be retained."‡

"If any shall deny sacramental confession, either to be instituted, or to be necessary to salvation by divine right; or shall say, the manner of making secret confession to the priest alone is not instituted and commanded by Christ, but is a human invention, let him be accursed."§

"If any shall say that in the sacrament of penance, it is not necessary to remission of sin, and

* Confess. Helvet. 2. c. 14. Argentinens. c. 20. August. de Confess. Saxon. de Pœnitentia. Wittemb. de Confessione.

† Concil. Lateran. Can. 21.

‡ Unde jam in universâ ecclesiâ, cum ingenti animarum fide-
lium fructu, observatur mos ille. salutaris, sacro illo et maximè
acceptabili tempore quadragesimæ, quem morum, &c.—Concil.
Trident. Sess. 14. cap. 5.

§ Si quis negaverit confessionem sacramentalem, vel institu-
tam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse jure divino, &c.—Concil.
Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 6.

that by divine right, to confess all, and every mortal sin, that one can by all due diligent premeditation call to remembrance, even those that are secret sins, and against the last precept of the decalogue, and the very circumstances which alter the kinds of sin, let him be accursed.”*

XVIII. *Of Penitential Satisfaction.*

1. The doctrine of the Scripture.

Ezek. xvi. 61—63. “Then shalt thou remember thy ways and be ashamed. And I will establish my covenant with thee, that thou mayest remember and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame, when I am pacified towards thee, for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord.” And xxxvi. 31, 32. “Ye shall loathe yourselves in your own sight. Not for your sakes do I this. Be ashamed and confounded for your own ways.” See Hos. xiv. 2, 4.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

“Although repentance is not to be rested in as any satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof, which is the act of God’s free grace in Christ; yet is it of such necessity to all sinners, that none might expect pardon without it.” So other churches.†

* Si quis dixerit in sacramento pœnitentiæ ad remissionem peccatorum necessarium non esse jure divino confiteri, omnia et singula peccata mortalia, &c.—Concil. Trid. Sess. 14. Can. 7.

† August. de Confessione. Saxon. in Præfatione, et artic. de Satisfactione. Wittemb. de Satisfactione.

3. The doctrine of the papists.

“If any shall say, that the whole punishment, together with the guilt, is always remitted by God, and that the satisfaction of the penitent is no other than the faith whereby he apprehends Christ to have satisfied for him, let him be accursed.”*

“If any shall say, that God is not satisfied for sins, as to temporal punishment, through the merits of Christ, by the punishments which he inflicts, and we patiently bear, or by such as are enjoined by the priest, nor by those that we voluntarily put ourselves unto, nor by fastings, prayers, alms deeds, and other works of piety, and that therefore the best repentance is only a new life, let him be accursed.”†

“If any shall say, that the satisfactions whereby penitents through Jesus Christ redeem sins, are not the worship of God, but the traditions of men, thwarting the doctrine of the grace and true worship of God, and the benefits of the death of Christ, let him be accursed.”‡

XIX. *Of Venial Sins.*

1. The doctrine of Christ and his apostles.

Matt. xii. 36. “I say unto you that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment.” Rom. vi. 23.

* Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 12.

† Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 13.

‡ Concil. Trident. Sess. 14. Can. 14.

“For the wages of sin is death.” See Rom. v. 12, and Isa. lv. 7.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

“As there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation, so there is no sin so great, that it can bring damnation upon those that truly repent.” So other churches also.*

3. The doctrine of the papists.

“Some sins are venial, neither offering injury to God, nor deserving hell, nor binding us to be sorry for them, but may be forgiven by knocking of the breast, going into a church, receiving holy water, or the bishop’s blessing, or crossing oneself, or by any work of charity, though we never think actually of them.† Those sins which in their own nature are not contrary to the love of God and our neighbour as idle words, immoderate laughing, those sins that are not perfectly voluntary, as sudden motions of anger, &c., and are in trivial things, as stealing of a halfpenny, &c., are venial sins; that is, do not turn us from God, and are easily expiated, like a slight hurt, which does not endanger life, and is easily cured.”‡

XX. *Of the State of Men after Death.*

1. The doctrine of the Scripture concerning the state of men after death.

* Confes. Bohemic. art. 4. Saxon. de discrimine peccatorum.

† Aquin. par. 3. Quest. 87. art. 3.

‡ Bellarm. tom. 3. de amissione gratiæ. lib. 1. c. 2. 3.

Luke xxiii. 43. "Verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Heb. xii. 23. "And to the spirits of just men made perfect." 2 Cor. v. 1, 8. "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God. Willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." Phil. i. 23. "Having a desire to depart and to be with Christ." See also Matt. vii. 13, 14. John iii. 18. Luke xvi. 23, 24; where, and in other places, the Scriptures speak of two ways; one leading to destruction, the other to life; and two sorts of men; some that do not believe, and they are damned; some that do, and they are saved; but no third way, or third class is mentioned.

2. The doctrine of the protestants.

"The bodies of men after death return to dust, and see corruption, but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God, who gave them. The souls of the righteous being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledges none."

So the reformed churches also in Helvetia, France, Saxony,* &c.

3. The doctrine of the papists.

“If any shall say that after the grace of justification received, the offence is so forgiven to every penitent sinner, and guilt of eternal punishment so removed, that there remains no guilt of temporal punishment to be suffered, either in this life, or the life to come in purgatory, let him be accursed.”†

By this parallel of doctrines, you may easily judge that ours is the old religion; and the religion of the papists (wherein they differ from us), is a new religion. For they that own, profess and hold to the same doctrines and worship that were taught by Christ himself and his apostles, and no other (as to essentials at least), are of the old religion; and those that, forsaking and corrupting the doctrine and worship taught by Christ and his apostles, maintain and hold doctrines not contained in the Scripture, but risen up since and contrary to it, are of a new religion. But the protestants do the first, and the papists do the last, as appears by the parallel of doctrines. Therefore the protestants are of the old religion, and the papists of a new one. For that religion which agrees with the oldest and the only rule, is the oldest and only religion; and if the

* Confess. Helv. 2. cap. 26. Gall. art. 24. Saxon. art. 11. August. 11. Wittemberg. cap. 25.

† Concil. Trident. Sess. 6. Can. 30. et Decret. de Purgat. Sess. 25.

papists will keep to the first and ancient rule, the word of God, they must be of our religion; if they will not, but add or diminish, they will never answer to the charge of novelty laid upon them.

So that their insulting and ridiculous question so often used, "Where was your religion before Luther?" is plainly and fully answered: "It was where the Romish religion never was, in the Scriptures, and in the primitive churches." And methinks, learned papists, who can read the writings of the fathers, and determinations of ancient councils, should be ashamed to propound such a question; but they do it to amuse the common people that cannot read Greek and Latin authors, and are not acquainted with the history of the church; whilst I am persuaded they themselves know better, and could resolve this question themselves, if they would read and judge impartially. But the people that cannot read the fathers, councils, &c. might be abundantly satisfied, that our religion is the old religion, because found in, and founded upon the word of God; for all the books in the world must give place to the holy, sure, infallible word of the most true and faithful God.

CHAPTER III.

THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS, HELD AND PROFESSED BEFORE LUTHER.

BUT though we show our doctrines to be found in the Scripture, our adversaries call for a catalogue of such as have taught them, from the apostles' times successively to the time of Luther, as they pretend they can do for theirs; and would persuade the people, that the church as now reformed, and the doctrines now received by them, are new and upstart things, and have not been since the apostles' times, or before Luther. On the contrary, we assert that there have been such doctrines, and a church owning them in all ages, since they were preached by the apostles; which we will prove by two heads of arguments; the one taken *a priori*, that such a church cannot, shall not cease, but always be in some part or other of the world; the other *a posteriori*, that it has not ceased, but has always actually been, and therefore before Luther.

The first,—that it cannot, shall not cease to be, taken *a priori*, stands firm upon these two grounds: First, upon the promise of Christ, that is of infallible verity. Christ has promised that the true church, which is built upon the doctrine of the Scripture, and is conformed thereto, shall continue

always, and not fail. That the reformed churches are built upon the doctrine of the Scriptures, and are conformed thereto, appears from the parallel of doctrines before laid down. So that there is evidence from the promise of Christ, that the church holding such doctrines as the reformed churches do, did continue, and could not fail; and therefore our church and religion were before Luther.

Secondly, upon the relation between Christ and his church. Christ is the only head of the church, and the church is the body of Christ. Christ is the king of his church, and the church subject to Christ. Christ is the husband and bridegroom of the church, and the church the wife and spouse of Christ. Such a church, then, could not cease to be, else there would have been some time in which Christ would have been a head without any body upon earth; a king without subjects, a husband and bridegroom, without a wife or spouse; all which are absurd. But the controversy does not lie between us on this point, but which church is this body, subjects, and spouse of Christ, which, by virtue of Christ's promise and its relation to him, could not fail or cease to be—theirs, or such as the reformed churches are. There is this ground (among others) on our side. That church which owns Christ to be her only head, husband, and king, and no other; which owns and professes subjection to the laws of Christ, and no other, as necessary to salvation; and worships the true God according to the Scripture, and no other,

is the body, spouse, and subjects of Christ, that could not cease to be in any age. But such churches as the reformed are, own Christ to be their only head, husband, and king, and no other; and profess subjection to the laws of Christ, and no other, as necessary to salvation; and worship God according to the rules contained in the Scripture, and no other. All which the Roman church, as papal, does not do; for they own another head besides Christ, as necessary to salvation, and profess subjection to the laws of another, besides the laws of Christ, and that equally with them, yea, before them, though distinct from, and contrary thereto, and give religious worship to others besides the true God, and so play the harlot. Hence, we conclude, that such churches as the reformed are, and not such as the papal, are the body, subjects, and spouse of Christ, which could not cease in any age to be, since the apostles' times; and therefore our religion was before Luther.

The second evidence, that there have been the same doctrines, necessary to salvation, taught all along since the apostles successively, to Luther's times, is a *posteriori*, from the writings of men, and histories of the church, abundantly satisfactory to us, and undeniable by our adversaries. It would be no real prejudice to the truth of our doctrines, if we could not give a catalogue of names that held and professed them in all ages, so long as we find them in the Scripture; nor could they for want thereof be

justly charged, either with falsity or novelty; for what is in the word of God is true and old, and what is not contained therein and made necessary to salvation, is false and new, though of many hundred years' standing. That this is unreasonably required by the papists, and is no hurt to our religion, as to the truth and antiquity of it, and no cause of stumbling to any, will appear by these things following.

1. It is not necessary in order to prove ourselves men, to give the names of all the men that have lived before us, no, nor of any of them. It is sufficient that we can prove we have the same essential constituent parts of men as our predecessors had. That we have such bodies and such souls as they had, is a proof we are real men as they were, though we know not the names of all the intermediate persons successively by whom we have received our beings from them. So here; so long as we can tell and are sure we own and believe the same doctrines that the apostles did, we are sure we are of the same religion as they were, though we could not give the names of the persons that have from time to time professed the same.

2. It is not necessary in order to know the falseness of any doctrine that we should know the names of the heretics that have handed them down from one age to another; but we know them to be false, by their being contrary to the Scripture.

3. We know that the dictates of the law of na-

ture are good and true, and that we have such a law, though we cannot give an account of the name of our ancestors from whom we have received them.

4. A man might be an exact artificer, though he be not able to mention the names of those who in all ages have professed the same occupation, from the times of those that first invented them. So a man might be a good Christian, and of the true religion, and be ignorant of the many thousands of Christians that have been before him.

5. Without this knowledge a man might love God, repent, believe and be saved; therefore it is not necessary to true doctrine, religion or salvation; else every unlearned believer must be acquainted with all the histories of the church, and fathers, and professors before him, which is impossible.

6. If a man did know this, yet he might be damned. If a man could tell all the writers, preachers, doctors and councils that have lived since the apostles' days, he might go to hell at last. God will condemn men for being ignorant of the essential points of Christianity, contained in the Scripture, and for want of faith and repentance, but not for being unacquainted with the histories of the church, and names of those that professed the true religion in the ages before them.

7. The Scripture never sends us to histories, councils and fathers as judges of true doctrine and religion, but to the word of God. Where in Scrip-

ture are professors or ministers commanded to study and be so conversant with all histories, councils and antiquities as to be able to give a catalogue, who have taught or owned the true doctrine in ages before them?

8. What deceitful dealing is this? to deny the people the reading of the Scriptures and acquaintance with them, and in such things commend ignorance as the mother of devotion, and yet call upon them to say, who taught their doctrines before Luther? As if it were more material to know who taught them, than to know them; or to be more skilled in the writings of men than in the word of God.

9. They call for that from us which they cannot give for themselves. You ask, Who taught your doctrines from the apostles' times? and we retort your question, Who taught all your doctrines from the apostles' times? We know you can never show them. I know you pretend a large catalogue of popes; but yet you are greatly puzzled to give their succession, when there have been several popes together, and they that then lived could not know which was the right. But if you could give a succession of persons, it profits nothing without a succession of true doctrine. If you could show a succession *de facto*, you can show none *de jure*. That may be actual, that may not be lawful. A thief may actually succeed a true possessor, and a tyrant and usurper a lawful prince, but not lawfully. This is usurpation, not legitimate succession. We

might say, therefore, to your people as you do to ours, Is it safe for you to continue in that religion, of which you can give no account who have taught your doctrines from the apostles' times? For you cannot do it, nor your doctors either, though they call a council and search all records and writings of men, as shall be shown in the next chapter.

Yet this is not said as if we doubted of our cause, if it were to be tried by the writings of the ancient fathers; or as if we could not mention multitudes before Luther that have taught and owned our doctrines; for there are many great volumes in which our doctrines are to be found. To give a large rehearsal of their words on our side would be an endless work; yet a few shall be picked out of many, sufficient to show that our doctrines, in which we oppose the doctrines of the church of Rome, have been taught of old.

What was the doctrine in the first hundred years from the birth of Christ is best understood from the Holy Scripture; and this is that age, and the writings of the apostles are those writings, by which the writings of all other ages must be examined, as their surest rule. That our doctrines are there contained, and not the doctrines of the papists as such, we have proved in Chap. I.

In the writings of the fathers that lived in the second century, we have many testimonies.

In this age the bishops of Rome had not that power they now challenge, as appears from a letter

of Eleutherius, bishop of Rome, to Lucius, king of England,* who had sent to the bishop for the Roman laws, as they were founded on Christianity; to whom Eleutherius sent this answer: “You require of us the Roman laws, and the emperor’s, to be sent over to you.—The Roman laws, and the emperor’s we may ever reprove, but the law of God we may not. You have received of late, through God’s mercy, in the realm of Brittany, the law and faith of Christ. You have with you, within the realm, both the parts of the Scripture. Out of them, by God’s grace, with the council of your realm, take a law, and by that law (through God’s sufferance) rule your kingdom of Britain; for you are God’s vicar in your kingdom.”—From whence it is clear, that this bishop of Rome (1) challenged not the supremacy over England, but acknowledged the king to be supreme governor in his own kingdom. (2) That he acknowledged the perfection of Scripture for life and manners, when laws should be taken from thence for the government of a kingdom. (3) That England received the gospel early, and not so late from the church of Rome as some of them boast, nor at all first from them, but from the Grecians of the eastern church,† as some think.

After the apostles, many taught our doctrines long before Luther. For the sake of brevity, I must take up with fewer heads of doctrine, and

* Fox. Acts and Mon. vol. 1. p. 139.

† Id. *ibid.* p. 133.

fewer testimonies under each doctrine. I had begun to give a catalogue in every century since Christ, but that being too large for this place, I laid it by, and give instances in these few following.

I. *The Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scripture to Salvation taught long before Luther.*

Justin Martyr,* who lived in the second century after Christ, writes, “That the true religion is contained in the writings of the prophets and apostles, who have taught all things necessary for us to know. We are not commanded to give credit to the traditions and doctrines of men, but those doctrines which were published by the prophets, and which Christ himself delivered. All things are to be brought to the Scripture, and from thence are arguments and proofs to be fetched; for if a man be never so often asked, how many do twice two make? he will still say four; so a Christian discoursing with others will always allege the Scripture.” And Irenæus says, “The Scriptures are perfect as spoken and dictated from the word of God and his Spirit.”†

So Tertullian,‡ A. D. 200, &c., writes, “I adore

* Just. Mar. in Tryph. et Paren.

† Scripturæ perfectæ sunt, quippe à verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ, Iren. adver. hæ. lib. 2. cap. 47.

‡ Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem.—Scriptum esse, doceat Hermogenis officina; si non est scriptum, timeat vae illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus destinatum. Tertul. adver. Hermog.

the fulness of the Scriptures. Let Hermogenes show that it is written; if it be not written, let him fear that wo appointed for those that add, or diminish." In another place, thus,* "We have the apostles of the Lord for our authors; who never brought in any thing at their own will, but what doctrine they had from Christ, they faithfully delivered to the nations; wherefore if an angel from heaven should preach otherwise to us, we would pronounce him accursed." To this objection [the apostles did not know all or if they did, they did not deliver all] he replies, "That both ways, such reproach Christ, as if he had sent apostles either unskilful, or unfaithful."† Again, "In matters of faith, men must argue no other way than from the Scriptures." In short, he lays down the doctrines of this age in a confession of faith, agreeable to that which is called the apostles' creed, and says, "They are not doubted of by any amongst us, but heretics." In the like manner speaks Origen,‡ who lived also in this age, of the perfection of the Scrip-

* *Apostolos Domini habemus authores, qui nec ipsi quicquam ex suo arbitrio, quod inducerent, elegerunt; sed acceptam à Christo disciplinam fideliter nationibus assignaverunt. Itaque etiam si angelus de cœlis aliter evangelizaret, anathema dicere-tur à nobis. Idem de Præsc. Hæret.*

† *Solent dicere, non omnia apostolos scisse,—omnia quidem apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse; in utroque Christum reprehensioni subjicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices apostolos miserit. Ibid. Aliunde suadere non possent de rebus fidei nisi ex literis fidei. Ibid.*

‡ *Id. ibid. Origen. in Levit. Hom. 5. tom. 1.*

ture: "In the two Testaments every word that appertains to God may be required and discussed, and all knowledge of things out of them may be understood; but if any thing remains, which the Holy Scripture does not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received to authorize any knowledge." And more in other places.* See also a large confession of faith by him, and Gregory Neocesar, containing the doctrines that we hold.†

Jerome‡ who died A. D. 420, says thus, "Whatsoever we affirm, we ought to prove out of the Holy Scriptures. The speakers' words have not so much authority as the Lord's command."

Ambrose§ also, who was born about the year 333, is of the same judgment. "We ought to add nothing, no, not for caution, to God's command; for if thou dost add, or diminish, it is a prevaricating of the command; the pure and simple form of the command is to be kept. Nothing therefore, seem it never so good, ought to be added to it. Therefore we ought not to add to or take away from the

* Hom. 2. in Hieremiam.

† Madgeburg. Cent. 3. p. 34, 35.

‡ Hieron. in Psal. 98.

§ Nihil, vel cautionis gratiâ jungere nos debemus mandato. Si quid enim vel addas, vel detrahas, prævaricatio quædam videtur esse mandati, pura enim et simplex mandati forma servanda. Nihil vel quod bonum videtur, addendum est. Docet igitur nos præsentis lectionis series neque detrahare aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neque addere. Ambr. tom. 4. de Paradis. cap. 12.

commands of God.” Again, he saith, “Who shall speak where the Scripture is silent?”* Augustine (born A. D. 355) subscribes the same doctrine. “In those things which are laid down plainly in the Scripture, all those things are found which belong to faith, or direction of life.† “Let us not hear, this I say, this you say, but let us hear, thus says the Lord;‡ there is God’s book, to whose au-

* Sanctis Scripturis non loquentibus, quis loquetur? Idem. de Voc. Gent. l. 2. c. 3.

† In iis quæ aperte in Scripturâ posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi. Aug. de Doct. Christ. tom. 3. l. 2. c. 9.

‡ Non audiamus, hæc dico, hæc dicis, sed audiamus, hæc dicit Dominus. Sunt certe libri Dominici, quorum auctoritati, utrique consentimus, utrique credimus; ibi quæramus ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram; auferantur illa de medio, quæ adversus nos invicem, non ex divinis canonicis libris, sed aliunde recitamus; quia nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis sanctam ecclesiam demonstrari. Idem de Unitat. Eccles. cap. 3. Legite nobis hæc de lege, de prophetis, de Psalmis, de ipso evangelio, de apostolicis literis; legite et credimus. Idem. ibid. cap. 6. Ipse Dominus Jesus discipulos testimoniis legis et prophetarum confirmandos esse magis judicavit. Hæc sunt causæ nostræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc firmamenta. Idem. ibid. cap. 16. Nemo ex me quærat sententiam meam, sed potius audiamus oracula, nostrasque ratiunculas divinis summittamus affatibus. August. de Mor. Eccl. Cath. cap. 7. tom. 1. Per Scripturas divinas multo tutius ambulatur. Controversia ex eâdem Scripturâ terminetur. Id. de Doct. Christ. cap. 8. Sententias Ambrosi, Hieronymi, &c. non ob hoc interponere volui, ut cujusquam hominis sensum tanquam Scripturæ canonicæ auctoritatem sequendum arbitreris. Id. Epist. 112.

thority we both consent, both believe. There let us seek the church, there let us discuss our cause. Let those things be taken from amongst us which we quote one against another, from any source but the divine canonical books; for I will not, that the holy church be demonstrated from the documents of men, but from the oracles of God." Again, "Read us these things out of the law, out of the prophets, or psalms, or gospel, or the apostles' epistles; read ye, and we believe." Again, "Our Lord Jesus himself did rather judge that his disciples should be confirmed by the testimony of the law and prophets. These are the proofs, foundation, and strength of our cause." Again, "Let no man ask me my opinion, but let us hearken to the Scripture, and submit our petty reasonings to the word of God. We walk much safer according to the Scripture; controversies are to be determined by the Scripture." Again, "I insert the opinion of Ambrose, Jerome, &c., not that thou shouldst think that the sense of any man is to be followed as the authority of canonical Scripture." Augustine has abundance more in many places of such doctrine, and he was above a thousand years before Luther.

Chrysostom also, who lived in the same age, and died about the year 407, taught the same doctrine, in this point, as the reformed churches now do. Thus he writes: "Would it not be an absurd and preposterous thing, that when we have to do with

men in matters of money, we believe them not, but count it after them; but when we are to judge of things, we are simply drawn into their opinions; and that, when we have the law of God for an exact rule, balance, and square of all things. Wherefore I beseech and entreat you all, that you matter not, what one or another thinks of these things; but that you would consult the Holy Scriptures concerning them.”* In another place, thus: “These things which are in the Holy Scripture, are clear and right; whatsoever is necessary, is manifest therein.”† Many more testimonies we might have from this author, and others quoted in the note,‡ but brevity forbids the transcribing of their words. To conclude this particular, take the testimony of a

* Πως γαρ ουκ ατοπον υπερ μεν χρηματων μη ελεοις πιστευειν, αλλ’ αριθμω και ψηφω τουτο επιτρεπειν, υπερ δε πραγματων ψηφισμενους απλως ταις ετερων παρασυρεσθαι δοξαις: και ταυτα ακριβη ζυγον απαντων εχοντας και γνωμονα και κανονα, των θειων νομων την αποφασιν; διο παρακαλω και δεομαι παντων υμων αφεντες τι τω δεινι και τω δεινι δοκει περι πουλων, παρα των γραφων ταυτα απαντα πυνθανεσθε. Chrys. Hom. 13. in 2 Cor.

† Ταυτα σαφη και ευθρα τα παρα ταις θειαις γραφαις. Παντα τα αναγκαια δηλα, Idem Homil. 3. in 2 Thess. cap. 2.

‡ Cyprian. lib. 2. Epist. 3. et ad Quintinum, et ad Pompeium; et ad Jubajanum. Αυταρκεις εισιν αι αγιαι και θεοπνευστοι γραφαι προς την της αληθειας επαγγελιαν. Athanas. tom. 1. pag. 1. ‘Η μεν αληθης και ευσεβης εις τον κυριον πιστις φανερα πασι καθεστηκεν εκ των θειων γραφων γνωσκομενη τε και αναγνωσκομενη. Idem. tom. i. 398. ‘Η θεια γραφη παντων εστιν ικανωτερα. Idem. pag. 114. vide etiam pag. 217. 428. Τα μεν συμφωνα ταις γραφαις δεχεσθαι, τα δε αλλοτρια αποβαλλειν. Basil. Mag. in Moral. lib. Sum. 72. cap. 1. vide etiam eundem. Sum. 80. cap. 22. et Homil. de Confes. fidei. et passim.

council, wherein are many witnessing together, that the Scripture is so perfect that nothing is to be added to it.* Ambrose said, “Anathema to him, that adds any thing to the Scripture, or takes from it; and all the bishops said, let him be accursed.” And their own canon law,† reciting the words of Cyprian, “That the Scripture must be followed, and not custom or traditions,” says, “If Christ only is to be heard, we ought not to regard what any one before us thought was to be done; but what Christ, who was before all, did; neither ought we to follow the custom of men, but the truth of God; since the Lord has said by the prophet Isaias, “In vain do they worship me, teaching the commands and doctrine of men.” And again,‡ “It is not lawful for the emperor, or any other person piously disposed, to presume any thing against the divine precepts, nor to do any thing that is contrary to the rules of the evangelists, prophets, or apostles.” Then their writings must be perfect, or we shall often be at a loss for want of a rule to direct us. All these, and multitudes more, taught this long before Luther.

* Concil. Aquileien. Surius. tom. 1. de Concil. p. 477.

† Corp. Jur. Can. Distinct. 8. c. si Solus.

‡ Ibid. Distinct. 10. c. non licet.

II. *That the People ought to read the Scripture, and therefore it ought to be translated into Vulgar Tongues, was a Doctrine taught long before Luther.*

By Chrysostom,* “‘Let the word of God dwell in you richly’—he doth not say only ‘let it dwell in in you,’ but ‘in great abundance.’ Hear this, ye worldly men, that have wives and children, how he commands you to read the Scriptures, and that not slightly, but with all diligence. Hear this, I pray you, all ye that are careful about the things of this life, and get you Bibles, which are the medicines of your souls. Ignorance of the Scriptures is the cause of all evils. We go to war without our weapons, how then can we be safe?” &c. In another place, he instructed the people, “That when they went from the congregation to their houses, they should take their Bibles, and call their wives and children to participate of the discourse of the things that were said.” And in another place, he exhorts them diligently to attend the reading of the Holy Scripture, “Not only when they came to the assembly, but

* Ἀκουσάτε ὅσοι ἐστέ κοσμικοὶ καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ παιδῶν προϊστάσθε, πῶς καὶ ὑμῖν ἐπιτρέπει μαλίστα τὰς γραφὰς ἀναλίσκωσθαι. Καὶ οὐκ ἁπλῶς οὐδὲ ὥς ἐτυχεν, ἀλλὰ μέγα πολλῆς τῆς σπουδῆς.—ἀκουσάτε, παρακαλῶ πάντες οἱ βιωτικοὶ καὶ κλῆσθε βιβλία φάρμακα τῆς ψυχῆς. Τοῦτο πάντων αἰτίον τῶν κακῶν, τὸ μὴ εἶδέναι τὰς γραφὰς. Χωρὶς ὅπλων εἰς πολεμὸν βαδίζομεν καὶ πῶς εἰσι σωθῆναι, &c. Chrysost. in Coloss. Homil. 9. Item in Mat. Homil. 2. in Mat. Hom. 5. to this purpose also, de Lazar. Hom. 3. in Genes. Homil. 29. In Johan. Homil. 1.

at home to take the Sacred Scriptures into their hands;" and this he does by an argument drawn from the great profit that they may receive thereby. Elsewhere, he also mentions, that the Syrians, Egyptians, Indians, Persians, Ethiopians, and multitudes more, had the doctrines of the Scripture translated into their own tongues.

The like also by Saint Augustine,* "It is come to pass that the Scripture, wherewith so many diseases of men's wills are healed, proceeding from one tongue, which fitly might be dispersed through the world, being spread far and wide by means of the divers languages whereinto it is translated, is thus made known to nations for their salvation; which, when they read, they desire nothing else but to attain to the mind of him that wrote it, and so to the will of God, according to which we believe such men spake."

To the new doctrine of Hosius, president at the council of Trent,† "That a distaff was fitter for women than a Bible," we will oppose the testimony of Theodoret,‡ of the old practice in the church on this point: "You shall every where see these points of our faith to be known and understood, not only by such as are teachers in the church, but even of cobblers, and smiths, and weavers, and all kinds of artificers; yea all our women, not they only who

* Aug. de Doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 5.

† Hos. de Expres. Dei Verb.

‡ Theodorot. de Curand: Græco. affect. lib. 5.

are book-learned, but they also that get their living with their needle, yea maid servants, and waiting women; and not citizens only, but husbandmen of the country, are very skilful in these things; yea, you may hear our ditchers, and neat-herds, and wood-setters, discoursing of the Trinity and creation," &c.

III. *That Religious Worship was not to be given to Images, or Reliques of Saints, was taught long before Luther.*

When Polycarp suffered, the envious persecutors not willing that his body should be honourably buried, as the Christians were desirous to do, moved the proconsul not to deliver to the Christians the body of Polycarp, lest they, leaving Christ, should fall to worship him; concerning which the Church of Smyrna, in their epistle to the church at Philomilium, &c., said, "This they said, being ignorant of this, that we can never forsake Christ, and that we can worship no other; for we worship Christ as the Son of God, the martyrs we love as disciples and followers of the Lord."*

About the time of Sylvester I., who lived A. D. 314, a council was so far from worshipping images, that "they would not have any pictures in the churches, lest that which is worshipped or adored

* Euseb. Eccles. Histor. lib. 4. cap. 15.

should be painted on walls.”* Also, about the year 700, a synod at Constantinople (which the Greeks call the seventh,) not only condemned the worship of images, but also images themselves, and that they should be cast out of churches. Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea (not the ancient of that title, but another since him), wrote a book against images, which was read and approved by this council, and inserted into the synodical acts as a common decree; in which book there are testimonies of Scripture and fathers against the idolatry of images; and that they would not allow any image or picture of Christ, but anathematized them that should draw his effigies in material colours, (Can. 8—13), and determined that there was one only image appointed by Christ, to wit, the blessed bread and wine in the eucharist [Lord’s supper] which represent to us the body and blood of Christ. The second Nicene synod was against this, and for images, and a synod at Francfort against the second council and their images.†

Pezelius gives us this account, that Leo III., emperor, called a synod about the year 730, in which it was controverted, whether images were to be worshipped, &c. the issue whereof was that the fathers then present, (except only Germanus, who

* Placuit, picturas in ecclesia esse non debere; ne quod colitur, aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur. Concil. Eliber. Can. 36.

† Illiric. Catal. Test. Verit. pag. 73, 74.

therefore resigned, and one Anastasius was chosen in his room) condemned and subscribed, that the worshipping of images and relics was mere idolatry, contrary to the Scripture; and the intercession of saints a fable. The emperor put the decrees of the synod into execution, commanded the images to be brought into the midst of the city and burned; and the pictures on walls to be whited over, and so defaced; and wrote to pope Gregory III. (according to some, Gregory II.) and commanded him, as he would keep in his favour, to do the like. After him his son Constantinus, called Copronymus, out of his zeal, called a synod at Byzantium, A. D. 754, which is called the seventh general council, where were present 338 fathers, where the question was discussed, whether it was lawful that images should so much as be in churches; they receiving the decrees of the first and second councils of Constantinople, Ephesus, Nice, and Chalcedon, determined with one consent, that all images should, as abominations, be cast away. Pezel. and Lampad. Mellific. Histor. par. 3. pag. 37, 41.

IV. *That Invocation of Angels and Saints is unlawful, was taught long before Luther.*

By the council of Laodicea which was about the year 364, according to Caranza, who, relating the canon I am to produce, for *Angelos* reads twice *Angulos*, to evade the force of the council's canon, which he could not stand before; for which tricks

of legerdemain their translations are little to be trusted to. See the Greek text.

“Christians ought not to forsake the church of God, and go and call upon angels, and gather assemblies, which are forbidden; if therefore any shall be found giving himself to this secret idolatry, let him be accursed, because he hath forsaken our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and hath approached to idolatry.”*

The papists are so humble that they will not go to God, but have recourse to saints, to intercede for them. Who taught the contrary before Luther? Multitudes. One of which, because it is so much to the point, I will transcribe. Ambrose, who died A. D. 397, condemned those “who used such a miserable excuse, in that they think to go to God by these, as men go to a king by his nobles. Go to, is any man so mad or so unmindful of his salvation as to give the king’s honour to a courtier? which if any do, are they not righteously condemned as guilty of treason? And yet these do not think themselves to be guilty, who give the honour of the name of God to a creature, and forsaking the Lord, adore their fellow servants. For men go to the king by tri-

* Ότι ου δει Χριστιανους εγκαλειπειν την εκκλησιαν του θεου, και απινααι και αγγελους ονομαζειν και συναξεις ποιειν, απερ απηγορευται. Ει τις ουν ευρεθη ταυτη τη κεκρυμμενη ειδωλολατρεία σχολαζαν εστω αναθεμα. Ότι εγκαλειπεν τον κυριον ημαν Ιησουν Χριστον, τον υιον του θεου, και ειδωλολατρεία προσηλθεν. Consil. Laodic. Can. 35. Codice Canonum Eccles. Univers. Can. 139.

bunes or officers, because the king is but a man, and knows not to whom to commit the state of the commonwealth; but to procure the favour of God, (from whom nothing is hid, for he knows the works of all men) we need no spokesman, but a devout mind; for wheresoever such a one shall speak unto him, he will answer him.”*

V. That there are but two Places for the Souls of Men after Death, and consequently no Purgatory, was taught long before Luther.

Augustin, born above a thousand years before Luther, taught, “That there is no middle place for any. He must needs be with the devil that is not with Christ.”† Again, “The catholic faith, resting upon divine authority, believes the first place, the kingdom of heaven; and the second, hell; a

* Solent tamen pudorem passi, neglecti Dei miserâ uti excusatione, dicentes per istos posse ire ad deum, sicuti per comites pervenitur ad regem. Age, nunquid tam demens est aliquis, aut salutis suæ immemor, ut honorificentiam regis vendicet comiti, cum de hac re si qui etiam tractare fuerint inventi, jure ut rei damnentur majestatis? et isti se non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, et relicto domino conservos adorant. Nam ideo ad regem per tribunos aut comites itur, quia homo utique est rex, et nescit quibus debeat rempublicam credere. Ad Deum autem (quem utique nihil latet, omnium enim merita novit) promerendum suffragatore non opus est, sed mente devota. Ubicunque enim talis loquutus fuerit ei, respondebit illi. Ambros. in Roman. c. 1.

† August. de Pec. Merit. et Remis. l. 1. c. 28.

third we are wholly ignorant of.”* Again, “What Abraham says to the rich man in Luke, ‘That the righteous, though they would, cannot go to the place where the wicked are tormented;’ what does it mean, but that the godly can afford no help of mercy, though they would, to those that are shut up in prison after this life, that they should come out from thence, and that through the unchangeableness of God’s judgment?”† Again, “There is no place for the amending of our ways but in this life; for after this life every one shall receive according to what he seeks after in this; therefore the love of mankind constrains us to intercede for sinners, lest by punishment they so end this life, that their life being ended, their punishment never ends.” Another, “Whatsoever state or condition, whether good or bad, a man is taken in when he dies, so must he abide for ever; for he shall either rest in eternal happiness with the saints and the Lord Christ, or shall be tormented in darkness with the wicked and the devil.”‡ This cannot be purgatory, for the papists do not say that the wicked, or the devils are in purgatory, but in hell.

VI. *That the Marriage of Ministers was lawful, was taught long before Luther.*

Long before indeed; for the sixth of the (sup-

* Idem. Quest. Evang. lib. 2. cap. 38.

† Idem. ad Maced. Epist. 54.

‡ Olympiodor. in 11. cap. Ecclesiast.

posed) apostolical canons, owned by the church of Rome, is in these words, "Let not a bishop or a presbyter, upon pretence of religion, put away his wife; but if he do, let him be excommunicated; if he shall persist therein, let him be deposed."*

The council at Ancyra also decreed, "That such as in their ordination declared their purpose to marry, if they did so, should continue in their ministry."† Another council, about the year 300, decreed, "That if any should judge, that he ought not to partake of the oblation from a married presbyter, let him be accursed."‡ And the first general council at Nice, that had this under debate after Paphnutius had delivered his judgment about it, left it at every minister's liberty to marry, or not marry, as they should see cause;§ which the Romanists' canon law also sets down. Likewise this is fully stated in the sixth general council, "That the lawful marriages of holy men should be valid, but whosoever is found diligent should no way be hindered from that office, because of living with his lawful wife. Therefore if any shall presume, contrary to the apostle's rules, to deprive any presbyters or deacons, of communion with their lawful wives, let him be

* Caranz. Sum. Concil. p. 14.

† Concil. Ancyran. Can. 10. Codice vero Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 30.

‡ Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 63. Concil. Gangrens, Can. 4.

§ Corp. Jur. Canon. Distin. 31. c. Nicæna Synodus.

deposed.” Well said! and if this could have been put into execution, the pope would have been down long before now, or mended his tyrannical dealings; and yet this stands in their canon law,* and they act quite contrary to it. There being so many councils, and so many ancient fathers in all these councils, I need not look for more, to tell you who taught this doctrine before Luther.

VII. *Communion in both kinds was taught long before Luther.*

By Ignatius; “One bread is broken to all, and one cup distributed to all.”† And by Justin Martyr; “They give to every one that is present, of the consecrated bread and wine, as Christ commanded them.”‡ And by Cyprian; “How do we invite them to shed their blood for Christ in the confession of his name, if when they set forth to fight for him, we deny them his blood? How shall we fit them for the cup of martyrdom, if before, we admit them not by right of communion, to drink of the Lord’s cup in his church?”§ In another place thus; “Because some men out of ignorance,

* Jus Canon. pars prim. distinct. 31. c. quoniam in Roman.

† Εἰς καὶ ἄγλος τοῖς πασὶν ἐθρυφθῆ, καὶ ἐν πόλῃσι τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμηθῆ. Ignat. ad Philad.

‡ Διδασκὶν ἕκαστῳ τῶν παρόντων μέλαλβειν ἀπο εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καθὼς παρέδωκεν ἐντεταλθαι αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦν. Just. Apol. 2. in fine.

§ Cyprian. Epist. 54.

or simplicity, in sanctifying the cup of the Lord, and ministering it to the people, do not that which Christ the institutor thereof did and taught, I thought it both matter of religion and necessity, to acquaint you herewith by letters, that if any one is held in that error, the light of truth being now discovered to him, he might return to the root and beginning of our Lord's institution,"* &c. Fully and plainly by Chrysostom, "That the people have as good a title to the cup as the minister. Sometimes, and in some things, there is no difference between the people and the priest, as in the participation of the dreadful mysteries; for all are equally admitted to them. In the time of the old law, it was not lawful for the people to eat of those things of which the priests ate; but it is not so now, for one body is offered to all, and one cup."*

I must quote here the doctrine of Leo the Great, who was a bishop of Rome, A. D. 440, and yet counted it sacrilege not to have the cup received by the people. He says thus, speaking of the Manichees; "And when, to cover their infidelity, they dare be present at our mysteries, they so carry themselves at the communion of the sacrament, that they may the more safely lie hid; they take the body of Christ with their unworthy mouths, but

* Cyprian. Epist. 63.

† Και θεμις ουκ ην τῷ λαῷ μετεχειν ὡν μέλειχεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, ἀλλ' οὐ νυν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σῶμα παρκεῖται, καὶ πόσηριον ἐν. Chrysost. in 2. Cor. Hom. 18.

they altogether decline the drinking of the blood of our redemption; which I would have you to know, that these men, by this mark, may be made manifest, and their sacrilegious simulation be discovered; and that, being marked, they may, by priestly authority, be driven from the society of the saints.”* &c.

Because in councils there are many witnesses at once, let us hear them. The council at Ancyra, held, A. D. 308, (which, though but provincial, yet as Caranza says, was confirmed by the general council at Nice), decreed, Can. 2: “that deacons that had sacrificed to idols, should not deliver the bread nor the cup in the sacrament.” Whence it appears that in that age the cup was given as well as the bread. And the council at Neocesarea, confirmed also by the Nicene council, Can. 13. decreed, “That the country priests, in the presence of the bishop, or presbyters of the city, should not give the bread, nor reach the cup; but if they were absent, they alone should do it.” At the general council at Chalcedon, consisting of 630 fathers, the seventh ac-

* Cumque ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant; ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujusmodi homines, et his manifestentur indiciis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et proditi, à sanctorum societate, sacerdotali autoritate pellantur, &c.—Leo 1. de Quadrages. Serm. 4.

cusation brought against Iba, bishop of Edessa, was, "That there was not sufficient quantity of wine provided, so that those who administered, were constrained to go to the taverns for more."* But why this complaint, if the people were not to drink as well as to eat? This being a general council, it seems, that through the whole church the cup was given to the laity. This was about the year 451, in the time of Leo I. In the third Toletan council it was decreed, that through all the churches of Spain and Gallicia, "the creed should be repeated with a loud voice, and the people make profession of their faith, before they receive the body and blood of Christ."† At the council of Ilerda, it was decreed, "That the clergy that deliver Christ's body and blood, should abstain from all men's blood, even of their enemies."† I will add one more testimony of one of their bishops of Rome, full and good protestant doctrine, which I find in their decretals. Gelasius, who was bishop of Rome, (for as yet there were no popes properly, as they now use the word,) in the year 492, says thus, "We have found that certain having received a portion of the sacred body, abstain from the cup of his sacred blood, being entangled with I know not what superstition. Let them either receive the whole sacrament, or else let them be wholly excluded from receiving, because the division of one and the self-same mystery cannot be

* Concil. Chalced. apud Surium, tom. 2. act. 10.

† Concil. Ilerd. Can. I. apud Magdeburg. Cent. 6. p. 467.

without grievous sacrilege.”* Well said, Gelasius! Hear it, ye papists, who ask, who preached our doctrine before Luther? Gelasius, bishop of Rome, taught of old that the not partaking in both kinds, is 1, superstition; 2, a maiming or halving of the sacrament; 3, that it is grand sacrilege. Was your bishop in his chair when he thus determined? and yet will you neither believe that he erred, nor yet give the cup to the people, though he *infallibly* dictated this to be a duty? Surely he erred in saying so, or you err in not doing so.

VIII. *That in the Lord's Supper after consecration, there is true and real Bread, and true and real Wine, was a Doctrine taught by many long before Luther.*

By Tertullian; “Christ taking the bread and distributing it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, ‘This is my body,’ that is [mark this] a figure of my body.”† By Augustine, who brings in our Saviour speaking after this manner, “Ye shall not eat this body which ye see, nor drink that blood which they shall shed that will crucify me: I have

* Comperimus autem, quod quidam sumptâ tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui procul dubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire. Corpus jur. Can. Decret. pars 3. Distinct. 3.

† Hoc est corpus meum, i. e. figura corporis mei. Tert. adv. Marc. l. 4.

commended a certain sacrament to you, which being spiritually understood will quicken you.”* By Gelasius, saying, “The sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of Christ, are a divine thing, by means whereof we are made partakers of the divine nature, and yet the substance or nature of bread and wine does not cease to be, and indeed the image and the similitude of the body and blood of Christ, are celebrated in the action of the mysteries.”†

By Ambrose; “How can that which is bread, by consecration, be the body of Christ? By the words of Christ. What words of Christ? By which all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the heaven was made; the Lord commanded, and the earth and the sea were made. Seest thou then how powerful is the word of Christ? If therefore there be such virtue in the words of our Lord to make those things that were not, to begin to be, how much more powerful is his word, that they remain the same they were, and yet be changed into another thing?”‡

* Non hoc corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt, qui me crucifigent; sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi: spiritualiter intellectum, vivificabit vos. August. in Psal. 98.

† Certa sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divina res est, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini. Gelasi. de Duab. Natur. in Christ. contra Eutychen.

‡ Si ergo tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent

This author acknowledges a change, but not a transubstantiating change, for he expressly says, "They are what they were." It was bread and wine before, and therefore though set apart for holy use, yet not changed into another nature, so as, for substance, to cease to be what they were. And he instances the change which takes place in conversion. We are made new creatures, but not by being changed into a new substance, but our souls are set upon right objects, &c. And when the objection is made, "But I do not see blood in kind," he replies, "But it has the likeness or similitude of it; and thou drinkest that which has the resemblance of the precious blood of Christ." This was taught then above a thousand years before Luther by this father. And so it was by Chrysostom also, who says, "If it be perilous to put these hallowed vessels to private use, in which is not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of his body is contained therein, how much more,"* &c.

esse quæ non erant; quanto magis operatorius est, ut SINT QUÆ ERANT et in aliud commutentur? Tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura; posteaquam consecratus es, nova creatura esse cœpisti. Sed forte dicis, speciem sanguinis non video. Sed habet similitudinem. Similitudinem preciosi sanguinis bibis. Ambros. de Sacram. lib. 4. cap. 4. edit. (mihi) Paris, 1529.

* Chrysost. in Mat. tom. postr. 2. Hom. 11.

IX. *That the Bishop of Rome was not the Universal Head of the Catholic Church, nor the Judge in whose definitive sentence all were bound to acquiesce, was taught long before Luther.*

In the second century after Christ, there were six councils, provincial only, the cause of which was the difference about the feast of Easter. Irænaeus,* president of the synod in France, wrote to Victor, then bishop of Rome, and sharply reprehended him for going about to sever from the unity in communion all the churches of Asia; which did not please all the bishops. So Eusebius. In the year 418 was the sixth council of Carthage, which resisted three popes one after another. About the year 450 the council of Chalcedon withstood Leo, then bishop of Rome, in the question of supremacy.

Illyricus, upon his word, affirms, that he saw an epistle of the bishops of France and Germany (written by Aventinus) to Anastasius, bishop of Rome, and others of his accomplices, the sum whereof was, to admonish the pope and those bishops of Italy that sided with him, to let them alone, and not proceed to exercise their tyranny over them. The whole epistle is to be found in Illyricus, Catal. Test. Verit. pag. 41.

The bishops also of Belgia, about the year 860,

* Euseb. Histor. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 23, 26. et lib. 7. cap. 5.

contested with the pope. Their epistle to pope Nicolas I. is taken by Illyricus out of Aventinus; in the close of which epistle they declare that for the causes beforementioned: "They would not stand to his decrees, nor hear his voice, nor fear his thundering bulls. 'Thou condemnest them that obey not the decrees of the senate. We assault thee with thine own weapon, that despisest the decree of our Lord God. The Holy Spirit is the author of all the churches which are spread both far and near; the city of our God, whose free denizens we are, is greater than that city which by the holy prophets is called Babylon, which exalts herself to heaven, and falsely glories that she never has erred, nor can err.'"*

Ludovicus, the emperor, son of Charles the Great, and the nobles and clergy in his time, did not own the bishop of Rome to have that headship and power which they now claim and usurp; when by his own authority, without any mention of the pope, he as-

* *Hisce de causis, cum fratribus nostris et collegis, neque edictis tuis stamus, neque vocem tuam agnoscimus, neque tuas bullas tonitruaque tua timemus; tu eos qui senatûs consultis non parent, impietatis condemnas. Nos tuo te ense jugulamus, qui edictum Domini Dei nostri conspuis,—Spiritus Sanctus autor est omnium ecclesiarum, quâ longissime et latissime terrarum orbis porrigitur. Civitas Dei nostri, cujus municipes sumus, major est urbe, quæ Babylonia à sacris vatibus appellatur, quæ—cælo se æquat, neque unquam se errasse, aut errare posse mendaciter gloriatur. Illyric. Catal. Test. Verit. (ex Aventin.) pag. 80.*

sembled several councils. Besides others, he called four several synods for the reformation of the church of France, viz. at Mentz, at Paris, at Lyons, and at Toulouse, to inquire what was held answerable or contrary to the revealed will of God, and wherein they departed from the Holy Scripture. He was so famous for the church's good procured by him, that Platina, bewailing the most horrible wickedness of the popes and their clergy in his days, cries out, "O Ludovice, utinam nunc viveres." O Ludovicus, I wish thou wert now alive.*

Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, openly published, "That it was not lawful for the inferior bishops, upon any public or general occasion, to consult the pope, unless they had first advised thereof with their own archbishops; that it was needless for archbishops to expect resolutions from the see of Rome concerning such things as are already sentenced in Holy Scripture, in the councils, canons and decrees of the church." He expounded those words, Tu es Petrus, thou art Peter, thus, "Upon this sure and solid confession of faith which thou hast made, will I build my church." And as touching the power of binding and loosing, he wrote to the pope himself, Leo IV., "That that power was passed and derived from St. Peter, and from the rest of the apostles, to all the chief heads of the church; and that St. Peter's privilege took place

* Illyric. Catal. p. 86.

only where men judge according to the equity of St. Peter, and is of force wheresoever that equity is used.”* If Luther had now been born, (as he was not for many hundred years after) this would have been called Luther’s doctrine.

Likewise when Leo IV. encroached upon the church of Germany, Luithpert, archbishop of Mentz, writing to Lewis, king of Germany, speaks much against the pope, saying, “That the church’s head ached, and if speedy remedy were not taken, it would quickly distil upon the members.”

Arnulphus, in a synod held at Rheims, noted the pope to be antichrist;† saying, “What, O reverend fathers, what I say think you him to be, who sitteth thus on a lofty throne, in purple robes, and glittering gold? Certainly, if he be void of charity, lifted and puffed up only with knowledge, he is antichrist, sitting in the temple of God; but if he want both charity and knowledge, then he is an idol;

* Magdeb. Centur. 9. pag. 338. *Proceres regni affirmare, inquit, illa nova et inaudita esse, quod papa velit sibi de jure regnorum judicia sumere; non posse eum simul episcopum et regem esse, &c. Hincmar. Apud Magd. Cent. 9. p. 356. Monet pontificem ne tam temere excommunicationes præcipiat. Sed patiatur causas diligentius in suis provinciis cognosci, et juxta canones dijudicari. Hincmar. Magd. Cen. 9. p. 524. Luithpert, Otgarius, Guntherus, Coloniensis, Thetgondus, Treverensis, et alii Episcopi Belgici graviter tyrannidem Rom. Pont. redarguunt. Magd. Cent. 9. p. 338. item Ecclesiæ Græcorum, et Imperatores contra Papam, vide Mag. Centur. 9. 340, 341.*

* See Magdeb. Cent. 16. p. 486—489.

and to seek to him for answer is to inquire of marble stones.”

Theophylact, archbishop of the Bulgarians, expounding these words, [Upon this rock will I build my church,] made no mention of the pope of Rome, saying, “That confession that Peter made, should become the foundation of the faithful, in such sort that every man that would build the house, must necessarily put this confession for his foundation.” Of the power of the keys he said, “Though it were only said to Peter, To thee will I give, &c., yet that power was once given to all the apostles, when he said, Whose sins ye remit, they shall be remitted.”*

Famous is the history of Otho,† who assembled a great synod in the church of St. Peter at Rome, of archbishops, and bishops in Rome, from Milan, Ravenna, Germany and France; to which pope John XIII. would not come; to whom a letter was sent by the emperor, that he would make his appearance to answer to the things of which he was accused (and they were very many and very heinous)‡ to which letter he returned this answer; “I

* Theoph. in Mar. c. 16. et Joh. 20.

† Magd. Centur. 10. de Synod. pag. 433, &c.

‡ Johannes 13. venationibus magis quam orationibus vacabat, et multa alia auditu indigna de eo dicuntur. Caranz. Sum. Concil. pag. 787. In hoc Concilio, objectis in Johannem criminibus, homicidii, perjurii, sacrilegii, incestus, aliorumque nefandorum scelerum, &c.—Luitprand, apud Baron. in Spond. Epitom. in annum, 963.

hear say you mean to create another pope, which if you do, I excommunicate you by the Omnipotent God, that you have no power to ordain any, nor to celebrate the mass.” When this letter was reading, the archbishop of Trevers, and other bishops of Lorrain, Liguria, and Æmilia came in, by whose advice the emperor and synod sent this answer: “That they made light of his excommunication, and they would return it upon himself; for when Judas had become a murderer, he could tie none but himself, strangling himself with a halter.”—Otho deposed pope John, and took into his hands the nominating and making of popes afterwards. As yet emperors were not come to wait barefoot at the pope’s palace, nor to hold his stirrups.

When the pope, A. D. 996, sent a cardinal into France to consecrate a church there, the prelates of France hearing of it, “judged it to be sacrilegious presumption, proceeding from blind ambition, that he should transgress apostolical and canonical orders, especially being confirmed by many authorities.”*

Gregory VII., strictly forbidding priests to marry, writes to the princes of Germany, “That they should not frequent the masses of married priests:”†

* Glaber. *Historiarum*, lib. 2. cap. 4. Baron. *Annales*, Ann. 996.

† *Adversus Hildebrandi Decretum* (quo magnâ severitate sacerdotum conjugium damnabat per universum Christianum orbem) infremuit tota factio clericorum; hominem plane hæ-

but yet the bishops in Germany refused to yield to this decree, or to depose those priests that were married, defending themselves by the authority of the Scripture, ancient councils, and the primitive church; adding thereto, "That the commandment of God, and human necessity directly oppugned the pope's decree." They long continued to defend their liberty, insomuch that, seeing neither reason, nor prayer, nor disputation would serve the turn, the clergy consulting together what to do; some advised, not to return again to the synod, others to return and thrust out the archbishop from his seat, and give him due punishment of death for his deservings, that by the example of him, others might be warned hereafter, never to attempt that thing any more to the prejudice of the church, and the rightful liberty of ministers. The archbishop spake them fair, and bade them be of good hope; he would send again to Hildebrand (the pope) and they should have what would content their minds; willing them, in the mean time, to continue as they had done, in their cure and ministry. The next year

reticum, et vesani dogmatis esse clamitans.--Naclerus, vol. 2. *Generat.* 36. apud *Magd. cent.* 11. p. 389. *Quod sacerdotibus connubiis interdixit Hildeb. Pontifex, plerisque episcopis novum dogma, omnium maxime pestifera hæresis, quæ unquam Christianum perturbasset regnum, visa est. Quamobrem Italiæ, Germaniæ, Galliæ pontifices, Hildeb. contra pietatem Christianam, verbis, factis agere, facere decernunt; eundem ambitus, hæreseos, impietatis, sacrilegii condemnant. Avent. lib. 5. Annal. Illyric. Catal. et Mag. cent. 11. pag. 389.*

the pope sent bishop Curiensis as legate to the archbishop of Mentz, and assembled again a council, where the clergy were commanded, under pain of the pope's curse, to renounce their wives or their livings. The clergy still defended their cause with great constancy. In the end it broke forth into such a tumult, that the legate and archbishop hardly escaped with their lives. After this, the churches would choose their ministers themselves, and not send them to the bishops (the enemies of ministers' marriage) to be confirmed and inducted; but put them to their office without knowledge or leave of the bishop.

The pope wrote also about this matter to Otho, bishop of Constance; but this bishop would neither separate those that were married, from their wives, nor yet forbid them to marry that were unmarried.

The clergy of France stoutly opposed the pope's bull for the excommunicating of married priests that would not divorce their wives, declaring their reasons from the word of God, from councils, and from the necessity of nature; and resolved to lose their benefices, rather than put away their wives; saying, moreover, "If married priests would not please the pope, he must call to angels from heaven to serve the churches."* But if these clergymen would not be at the pope's beck, neither would the angels in heaven; whatever *other* angels might do.

* Fox, Acts and Mon. vol. 1. pag. 227.

In the pope's proceeding against Henry, the emperor, he was opposed by the council at Worms, in which were the bishops, not only of Saxony, but of the whole empire of the Germans, who agreed and concluded upon the deposing of Hildebrand; and Roulandus* was sent to Rome, who, in the name of the council, commanded the pope to yield up his seat.

This same pope was again judged and condemned by another council held at Brixia, where were divers bishops of Italy, Lombardy and Germany, in which condemnation is recited amongst other things, "his usurping authority over the emperor, and taking away and forbidding the marriage of priests."

Towards the end of the year 1000, (when there were again two popes at once, Urban and Clement III.) William Rufus,† king of England, would suffer no appeal from England to the pope of Rome, as it was not lawful to do from the time of William the Conqueror. And when Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, appealed to Rome, the king charged him with treason for so doing. All the bishops of

* Roulandus sacerdos, literas imperatoris deferens, absque omni salutationis honore, tibi (Hildebrandum compellans) inquit, imperator, et Italiæ, Galliæ, Germaniæque episcopi, præcipiunt, ut te, munere quod astu, pecuniâ, gratiâ occupasti, abdicēs. Non enim verus pastor, neque pater, neque pontifex es, sed fur, lupus, latro et tyrannus.—Aventin. lib. 5. An. Magd. Cent. 11. p. 425.

† Fox, Acts and Mon. vol. 1, p. 242.

the realm stood on the king's side against Anselm; though Anselm pleaded hard, saying, "Should I forswear Saint Peter, I should deny Christ." But all the rest of the bishops disowned any appeal from England to Rome.

About the year 1105, two famous bishops of Mentz, named Henry and Christian, recorded to be very virtuous and well-disposed, were cruelly and tyrannically dealt with by the pope. Henry would make no appeal to the pope, but said, "I appeal to the Lord Jesus Christ, as to the most high and just judge, and cite you (the two cardinals that had done him wrong) before his judgment, there to answer me before the high judge."* Upon which, they scoffingly said, "Go you before first, and we will follow after." Not long after the same Henry died, whereof the two persecuting cardinals having intelligence, said one to another jestingly, "Behold, he is gone before, and we must follow after according to our promise." A little after they both died in one day.

About this time the bishop of Florence taught and preached that antichrist was now manifest; for which pope Paschalis burned his books.†

At this time also historians mention two more famous preachers, Gerhardus and Dulcinus Navarrensensis, who earnestly laboured and preached against the church of Rome, defending and maintaining

* Acts and Mon. vol. 1, p. 254.

† Acts and Mon. 254.

“that prayer was not more holy in one place than in another; that the pope was antichrist; that the clergy and prelates of Rome were reprobates, and she the very whore of Babylon spoken of in the Revelations.” These two brought thirty more with them into England, who by the king and prelates were all burnt in the forehead, and so driven out of the realm, and after that were slain by the pope.

At this time also in the city of Toulouse, there was a great multitude of men and women whom the pope’s commissioners persecuted and condemned for heretics; of whom some were scourged naked, some chased away. One of the articles they maintained was, that the bread in the sacrament, after consecration, was not the very body of the Lord.*

In Germany also, Robert Abbot, of Duits, preached against the pope’s jurisdiction as to temporal dominion, and interpreted that place, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church,” to be understood concerning Christ, &c.

Besides these, Peter Bruis, A. D. 1126, and after him his disciple Henry, A. D. 1147, in France, drew many provinces from the church of Rome, preached against transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, suffrages and oblations for the dead, purgatory, worshipping of images, invocation of saints, single life of priests, pilgrimages, superfluous holy days, consecration of water, oil, frankincense, &c. The pope

* Fox, Acts and Mon. vol. 1, p. 209.

and his prelates they called "princes of Sodom;" the church of Rome they termed "Babylon, the mother of fornication and confusion." This Peter Bruis preached the word of God among the people of Toulouse for the space of twenty years, with great commendation, and at last was burned.*

I must but name Honorius, bishop of Augusta, who set out the iniquity and wickedness of the church of Rome to the life; recited largely by Duplessis, *Myst. of Iniq.* p. 294. And Nordbertus, A. D. 1125, who protested to Bernard, that antichrist he knew certainly would be revealed in this present generation. And John of Sarisbury,† who, visiting the pope, was asked by him, "What men thought of the pope, and of the Roman church," and told him to his face, "They say the pope is a burden to all, and almost intolerable." And much more.

Did the papists never hear of the Waldenses, or have they not been vexed with their doctrine before Luther was born, that they ask where was our doctrine and religion before Luther?

Did the council of Constance condemn the doctrines of Wickliffe and Huss as erroneous, and was there such a noise about them, and yet did not the church of Rome hear of our doctrines (then owned by them) before Luther? They can never make us believe it.

* Petr. Cluniacens. lib. 1. Epist. 1 et 2.

† Joh. Sarisbur. in Polier. lib. 6. cap. 24. Dupless. 319.

Let Rainerius, a friar, writing of the Waldenses, or Pauperes de Lugduno, satisfy them, who says, "Among all the sects that are or ever will be, none can be more pernicious to the church of God [he means the church of Rome] than that of Lyons." And he gives these three reasons, 1. "Because it has continued a longer time than any. Some say that it has been ever since the time of Sylvester; others say from the times of the apostles. 2. Because it is more general, for there is almost no country into which this sect has not crept. 3. Because all others procure horror by their blasphemies against God; this of the Lyonists has a great appearance of piety, inasmuch as they live uprightly before men, and put their trust in God in all things, and observe all the articles of the creed; only they blaspheme the church of Rome, and hold it in contempt, and therein they are easily believed by the people."* A fair confession for a papist! So that

* Inter omnes has sectas quæ adhuc sunt, vel fuerunt, non est perniciosior ecclesiæ quam Leonistarum; et hoc tribus de causis; prima est, quia est diuturnior, aliqui enim dicunt, quod duravit à tempore Sylvestri; aliqui a tempore apostolorum. Secunda, quia est generalior, fere enim nulla est terra, in qua hæc secta non sit. Tertia, quia cum aliæ omnes sectæ immanitate blasphemiarum in Deum, audientibus horrorem inducunt, hæc magnam habet speciem pietatis, eò quod coram hominibus justè vivant, et bene omnia de Deo credant, et omnes articulos qui in symbolo continentur, solum modo Romanam ecclesiam blasphemant et clerum, cui multitudo laicorum facilis est ad credendum. Rainer. Cont. hæc. cap. 4.

you see, they can tell if they will, where and when, and by whom, our doctrines were taught before Luther; but they use this question to beguile the ignorant people, "Where was your religion before Luther?"

And Jacobus, of Riberia, acknowledges that the Waldenses had continued a long time. "The first place," says he, "they lived in was in Narbonne, in France, and in the diocese of Albie, Rhodes, Cahors, &c.; and at that time, there was little or no estimation of such as were called priests, bishops, and ministers of the church; for being very simple, and ignorant almost of all things, it was very easy for them, through the excellency of their learning and doctrine, to get to themselves the greatest credit among the people; and inasmuch as the Waldenses disputed more subtilly than all others, they were often admitted by the priests to teach openly, not that they approved their opinions, but because they were not comparable to them in wit. In so great honour was the sect of these men, that they were both exempted from all charges and impositions, and obtained more benefits by the wills and testaments of the dead, than the priests."

Rainerius says of them, "that they had translated the Old and New Testament into the vulgar tongue. They teach and learn it so well, that I have seen and heard a country clown recite Job word for word, and divers others that could perfectly repeat all the New Testament."

The doctrines that these Waldenses taught before Luther, are the same that the reformed churches now hold. 1. That only the Holy Scripture is to be believed in matters of salvation. 2. That all things are contained in Holy Scripture, necessary to salvation, and nothing to be admitted in religion, but what is commanded in the word of God. 3. That there is one only Mediator; other saints in no wise to be made mediators, or to be invoked. 4. That there is no purgatory. 5. That masses sung for the dead are wicked. 6. All traditions to be rejected, at least as necessary to salvation. 7. That differences of meats, variety of degrees and orders of priests, friars, monks, and nuns, superfluous holy days, and pilgrimages, with all the rabblement of rites and ceremonies brought in by man, are to be abolished. 8. That the supremacy of the pope over all churches, and kings and emperors, is to be denied. 9. That the communion in both kinds is necessary to all people. 10. That the church of Rome is very Babylon, and the pope antichrist. 11. That the pope's pardons and indulgences are to be rejected. 12. That the marriage of ministers is lawful, &c. Their doctrines are related by Æneas Sylvius, afterwards pope, not their best friend. But the English reader might find them in the Book of Martyrs.* Luther began the reformation in the year 1517; these preached this doctrine before the

* Æneas Sylvius, *Bohemica Historia de Waldensium Dogmatibus*. Fox, *Acts and Mon.* vol. 1. pag. 299, 300.

year 1200; consequently our doctrine was before Luther.

It would be endless to give an account of particular doctors, who opposed the doctrine of the church of Rome, and maintained the doctrines we receive. I might mention Almaricus, a doctor of Paris, who suffered martyrdom for withstanding altars, images, invocation of saints, and transubstantiation. Also Everard,* an archbishop in Germany, in an assembly of bishops at Regensburg, gave his judgment of the bishop of Rome. "Hildebrand," said he, "under colour of religion, laid the foundation of the kingdom of antichrist. These priests of Babylon will reign alone; they can bear no equal; they will never rest, till they have trampled all things under their feet, and sit in the temple of God, and be exalted above all that is worshipped. 'He who is the servant of servants,' covets to be Lord of lords, as if he were God; his brethren's counsels, yea, and the counsel of his Master, he despises. He speaks great things, as if he were God; in his breast he casts new devices, whereby to raise a kingdom to himself; he changes laws, and confirms his own; he defiles, plucks down, spoils, deceives, murders. Thus that child of perdition (whom they use to call antichrist), in whose forehead is written the name of blasphemy, I AM GOD, I cannot err, sits in the temple of God, and bears rule far and near." Was

* Avent. lib. 7. p. 546.

this Luther, that speaks so like him against the pope? No; one born long before him, or else the papists would be ready to say, This doctor had learned this from Luther.

The preachers in Sweden, publicly taught that the pope and his bishops were heretics. It would be too long to give account, how the pope was opposed by Frederick II., and by John, king of England, a great while, though at last he delivered the kingdom of England and Ireland to the pope, and farmed them of him for a thousand marks per annum; and afterward was poisoned by a monk. And though he made this resignation of these kingdoms for himself, and his heirs forever to the pope, yet his son and successor, Henry III., made great opposition against it, as did the lords and nobles in his father's days, who have left a lamentation upon record of that fact, of king John.*

But the history of the Waldenses now spread far and near, stands like a beacon on a hill, that all who do not shut their eyes, have clear light to see

* Fox, Acts and Mon. vol. 1. Gulielmus Parisiensis circa Ann. Domini 1220, acerrime insectatur sacerdotes sui temporis, dicens, in eis nihil pietatis ac eruditionis comparere, sed potius diabolicas turpitudines, omnium spurcitiarum ac vitiorum monstruositatem; eorum peccata non simpliciter peccata esse, sed peccatorum monstra terribilissima, eos non ecclesiam, sed Babylonem, Ægyptum ac Sodomam esse; prælatos non ædificare ecclesiam, sed destruere, ac Deo illudere; eos cum aliis sacerdotibus prophanare ac polluere corpus Christi, &c. Lib. de Collatione Beneficiorum.

that our doctrines were taught, in abundance of places, before Luther, in Dauphiny, Languedoc, and Guienne, and in all those mountains which reach from the Alps to the Pyrenees. They had spread themselves into Germany, where were a great many of their preachers, who at the sound of a bell preached in a public place, "That the pope was a heretic, and his prelates seducers; that they had no power to bind and loose, or to interdict the use of sacraments; and that though they had not come, God would have raised up others, even of the very stones, to enlighten the church by their preaching, rather than he would have suffered faith utterly to have perished."

By this time they ordained preachers in Spain, who preached the same doctrine with them, and in Lombardy much multiplied. Yea, in one only valley, called Camonica, they had ten schools. Another says, that their little rivers streamed so far as to the kingdom of Sicily; and the only reason of their sufferings is said to be, because they withdrew the sheep from the keeping of St. Peter, and departed from the Roman church.

From the year 1300 the bloody persecutions and the great sufferings of multitudes for the true doctrine, and opposition to the church of Rome, prove what is sought after, unless they imprisoned and burnt so many, they know not for what. For Satan (according to some) being bound at the end of the first ten persecutions, and remaining bound a

thousand years, was now let loose again. Do they ask still, where was our doctrine before Luther? Why, where persecution was raised by papists before Luther; for why were so many imprisoned, banished and burnt, if they did not look upon them as heretics? and whom they so call is notoriously known. Was not Conradus Hager imprisoned for preaching against the mass? Were not Johannes de Castilone, and Franciscus de Arcatura, burnt, and Haybulus martyred, and Johannes de Rupe-scissa imprisoned for certain prophecies against the pope? Did not Militrius a Bohemian preach that Antichrist was come, and was he not excommunicated for the same? Was not Occam excommunicated, and his books prohibited, because they displeased the pope?

Brushius relates that six and thirty citizens of Maguntia were burned for following the doctrine of the Waldenses,* affirming the pope to be the great Antichrist. Also Massæus records, that one hundred and forty in the province of Narbon, were put to the fire, for not receiving the decretals of Rome; besides them that suffered at Paris, to the number of twenty-four; and after them four hundred burned for heretics.† Was not Matthias Parisiensis before Luther, who wrote that the pope was Antichrist? And was there not an ancient writing, called the

* Fox. Acts and Mon. vol. I. pag. 550.

† Acts and Mon. vol. I. p. 521—532.

“Prayer and Complaint of the Ploughman,” containing many things against the church of Rome? and Nicolas Orem preached against them before the pope.

Was not John Wickliffe before Luther? and did not he maintain the doctrines that the reformed church now holds? and was there not a great company of valiant defenders of the same truths? Twenty-five articles of Wickliffe you may read in the Book of Martyrs.* And may we not learn something by the laws then made in England, that many here opposed the church of Rome; as Anno 5. Rich. II. In the year 1380, we read of “a great number of evil persons, going about from town to town, preaching to the people divers sermons containing heresy and notorious errors” (so papists call our doctrines) “to the blemishing of the holy church.”

And were there not many witnesses against popish doctrines and asserters of ours from the year 1400? as John Badby, Nicolas Tayler, Richard Wagstaff, Michael Scrivener, William Smith, &c. John Huss, Jerome of Prague. But why do I men-

* Acts and Mon. I. p. 568, 569. Yea 45 articles of Wickliffe were condemned in the council of Constance. Surius in Concil. tom. 3. p. 790.

† Acts and Mon. Vol. I. beginning in the protestation to the church of England. Had the council of Constance so much ado with the articles of Huss and Jerome, who were charged with articles against the church of Rome, and condemned and burnt by the council, and yet do papists know none that taught our doctrine before Luther?

tion particular names, when there were a great number of faithful Bohemians not to be reckoned, and in many other places. The Bohemians in this age, near to Tabour castle, assembled themselves together to the number of thirty thousand, and having three hundred tables erected in the fields for that purpose, they received the sacrament in both kinds.*

In the statute Anno 2. Hen. IV. in the year 1402, in England, theret were many preachers of true doctrine, which those times called "new doctrines and heretical, contrary to the faith and determination of the holy church," [Rome forsooth.] It is recorded in the year 1422, that Henry Chichesly, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to pope Martin V. that there were so many in England infected with the heresy of Wickliffe and Huss, that without force of an army they could not be suppressed.

Besides all these that have preached and owned our doctrine long ago, we might send such papists as ask, Where was your doctrine before Luther? to the churches in other parts of the world, as to the Greeks, the Muscovites, the Melchites or Syrians, the Armenians, the Jacobites, the Copts, or Egyptian Christians, the Abyssinians and others, who, though very corrupt in many things, yet agree with the reformed churches in many points, wherein they

* Cochleus, lib. 4. ex Berkbeck. Protestant. Evid. p. 386.

† Acts and Mon. Vol. I. Protestat. to the church of England.

with us differ from the church of Rome; as is witnessed by David Chytræus, who travelled amongst many of them, and from his personal knowledge and conversing with many that were amongst them, and by letters from others, gives an account of the state of several churches; and by the confession of faith in the eastern churches, composed by Cryptopulus, patriarch of Constantinople, and others, as also by the confession of papists themselves.

1. These churches deny the pope's supremacy, that he is head of the church, and never submitted to him as universal head. Their words are, "It was never heard in the catholic church, that a mortal man, subject to a thousand sins, should be called the head of the church; but the head of the catholic church is Jesus Christ."* The Greeks account the pope and the Latins, as excommunicated persons, as Prateolus states. Of this opinion are the Muscovites, the Armenians, &c.

2. These churches agree with us in rejecting the apocryphal books from the number of canonical Scriptures.†

3. They give the sacrament in both kinds. They say, "Of necessity they must communicate in both

* 'Ουδε γαρ ἡκουσθη παρα καθολικη εκκλησια, ανθρωπον θνητον και μυριας αμαρτιας ενοχον κεφαλην λεγεσθαι της εκκλησιας, &c. Confes. fidei, Eccl. Orient. per Cryptopulum, cap. 23. Item David Chytræus de statu Ecclesiæ, pag. 21. Prateol. Elench. hæret. lib. 7. p. 202. Idem p. 228.

† Confess. fidei Eccles. Orient. per Crytop, cap. 7.

kinds, so that if any take it under one kind, although a layman, he sins, because he acts against Christ's command. All partake of both kinds, the bread and the cup, whether ecclesiastical, or laypersons, men and women.”*

4. They do not turn the sacrament into a sacrifice, offered for the quick and dead.

5. They have no private masses.†

6. The doctrine of transubstantiation is not received amongst them. They confess a true and real presence in the Lord's supper, but such a one as faith offers, not such as the devised transubstantiation vainly teaches.‡

7. They admit not the seven popish sacraments. They own properly but three, baptism, the Lord's supper, and penance.§

* Prateol. Elenc. Hæret. p. 202. *Μέτεχουσι δε πάντες ἐκ αἵτου τοῦ εἶδους τῶν ἐν τῇ δεσπολικῇ τραπέζῃ, τοῦ ἱερέως, καὶ τοῦ πόληριου; ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ τε καὶ λαϊκοί, ἀνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες.* Confes. fid. Eccles. Orient. cap. 9.

† Ex liturgiis Græcorum et narrationibus hominum fide dignorum constat, nec missas privatas absque communicantibus ab eis celebrari solere, nec ullam in eorum canone, sacrificii corporis et sanguinis Christi pro redemptione vivorum et mortuorum oblatis, mentionem fieri, &c. David Chytr. de Statu Eccles. p. 14.

‡ *Τὴν ἀληθινὴν καὶ βεβαίαν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμολογοῦμεν, καὶ πιστεύομεν, πλὴν ὅτι ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν παρίστησι καὶ προσφέρει, οὐκ ὅτι ἡ εὐεργετήσα εἰκὴ διδάσκει μέλουσιώσις, &c.* Cyril Patriarch. Constant. cap. 17. p. 60.

§ Confes. fidei Eccl. Orient per Crytop. cap. 5. *ὡς εἶναι τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἀναγκαῖα τρία; βάπτισμα, κοινωνία, μετάνοια.*

8. They admit ministers' marriage.*

9. They deny purgatory. It is true the Greek church do believe that there is a place distinct from heaven and hell, where some departed souls are lodged for a while. Their opinion is, that those who lived holily, and died in the Lord, go immediately to heaven, and the wicked who die without repentance go presently to hell; but such as are converted at the end of their life are in another place, in a middle condition, and for these they pray, but yet they do not call this purgatory. So Chytræus. And in their confession they utterly deny popish purgatory; for they affirm the punishment of such departed souls as are neither in heaven nor in hell, "is not material, neither by fire, nor by any other matter, but only from the affliction and anguish of their own consciences, remembering then what they did amiss, while they were in this world."† However far they are from the truth, yet they are far also from purgatorial fire. For Alphonsus says, "That it is one of the most known errors of the

* Confes. fidei Eccles. Orient. c. 11. et David Chytræus de Stat. Eccl. p. 14.

† Λεγει τοινυν ἡ ἐκκλησια την ἐκεινων ποινην μη ὑλικην ειναι, ειτ' ουν ὀργανικην, μη δια πυρος μητε δι αλλης, ὁποιασουν ὑλης, ἀλλα δια θλιψεως και ανιας της απο συνειδησεως συμβαινουσας τούτοις ἐκ του μιμνησκεισθαι των ὅσα ἐν τῳ κοσμῳ μη κατα λογον μηδε ὁσιως επραξαν. Confess. eadem cap. 20. Unus ex notissimis erroribus Græcorum et Armenorum est, quo docent nullum esse purgatorium locum, &c. Alphons. Adver. Hæres. lib. 12. p. 188.

Greeks and Armenians, that they teach no place of purgatory," &c.

10. Though the Greeks dote too much upon images of saints, yet they differ much from papists in this point; for they are against making any image of God, which the papists do in the likeness of an old man; and to other images they give (τιμην) honour, but neither the worship of Latria, nor Dulia. They say "God forbid, for these are only to be given to God."*

11. They carry not the sacrament in procession about the streets, as the papists do to be worshipped by them that meet it, except they send it to the sick; for, say they, "it was not given to be carried about the streets, but religiously to be received for the remission of sins, according to the word of God."†

12. They hold the perfection and sufficiency of the Scripture; that it is sacrilege to add any thing to it, or take away from it, and they contradict those that do.‡

* Οὐ γὰρ θεμὶς τὸν ἀπεριγραπτὸν θεὸν περιγραπτῇ εἰκόνι παρειαίνειν. Αἰς ἁγίαις εἰκοσὶ καὶ τιμὴν τὴν προσηκουσάν ἀπενειμομεν: οὐ λατρευτικὴν ἢ δουλικὴν, ἀπαγε, αὐταὶ γὰρ θεῷ μόνῳ προσηκουσιν. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. per Crytop. cap. 15.

† Οὐ περιφερομεν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ ἅγιον μυστήριον διὰ τῶν πλατειαῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ μόνον ὅταν κομιζέσθαι εἰς οἶκον νοσοῦντος, ὅτι οὐ διδόναι ἡμῖν τοῦτο ἵνα περιφέρῃται διὰ τῶν πλατειαῶν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ευλαβῶς μελεχῇται εἰς ἀφεσιν, κατὰ τὰ δεσποσικά ρημάτια. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. per eundem cap. 9.

‡ Ὅτις ἅγια γράφῃ ἐνεπιστευθῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, οὐχ ὅπως αὐτῇ μὴδεν προσλίδεῖται, ἢ ἀφαιρῶσα ἐκείθεν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἀνίερως ἱεροσυλία) ἀλλὰ

13. Concerning the marks of the true catholic and apostolical church, they greatly differ from the church of Rome; the confession mentions four, and the last they lay most stress upon, wherein they teach the same with us, namely, “that it faithfully and sincerely keep the word of God, which God has given to us by his prophets and apostles.”*

14. They do not define the catholic church as the Romanists do, by making it essential to submit to any one man as the head of the whole; but the whole company of such as are sound in the doctrine of Christ, every where dispersed, but knit together by the bond of the Spirit, is the catholic church.—Confess. eadem cap. 7.

By all this the reader may see the harsh and uncharitable spirit of the Romanists, who unchurch all those, who profess that they keep to all the doctrines of the first general councils,† in which essential doctrines were ratified, as appears by their creeds,

και τους τοιουτον τι τολμωντας, ἐλεγχει και καταφραζει. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. cap. 7.

* Τετάρτον και σαφεστάτον εκκλησιας γνωρισμα, το πιστως και ἀδολως παρακατεχειν το θειον ρημα ὃ ὁ θεος ἐξεδετο δια προφητων και αποστολων. Confess. fid. Eccl. Orient. cap. 7.

† Ἑπτα γαρ και μονας οἰκουμενικας Συνόδους ἡμεῖς αποδεχομεθα. και ὅσαι αἱ οἰκουμενικαι ἐπὶ τα ἐδεξαντο τε και ἐβεβαιωσαν—Confessio eadem. cap. 15. Acta septem Synodorum Græcarum, Scripta Basilli, Chrysostomi, Damasceni, eorumque traditiones tanquam divina oracula amplectuntur, ad eaque de fide et religione ipsorum sciscitantes remittunt, ex literis Constantin. ad Dav. Chytr. de statu Eccles. p. 71.

containing the articles of the Christian faith; but the Muscovites condemn and curse the Romans as forsaking the primitive church, and breaking the seven general synods. He may also see their impudence in asking, Where our church and doctrines were before Luther? when there have been so many churches, ever since the apostles' times, that have, though not without many corruptions in many things, yet held to the essential doctrines of the Christian religion, and have not received these doctrines of the church of Rome, which is but a little church in comparison of all the rest, amongst whom our religion was before Luther.

CHAPTER IV.

HAVING shown that the doctrines of the reformed churches are the same that were taught by Christ and his apostles, and that by many after them long before Luther; the next thing is to demonstrate that popery is a novelty. This follows, indeed, by just and good consequence from what has hitherto been said. For two doctrines, which are so contrary, yea, so contradictory, cannot both be true, and equally old; for truth must be before error. But yet, to prove that popery, as now framed, had not its being till many hundred years after Christ, I shall pick out some of the most material points of popery, (and if these fall the others cannot stand) and give an account of the time when they first came in. The rest, whose rise is more uncertain, though clear enough that they were not from the beginning, nor long, long after, will not need such large insisting on; and yet in all, I must study brevity, which is a task that lies upon me, and pinches me hard all along in so copious a subject as this position is.

First, I shall begin at the head—the supremacy of the pope—which is indeed the head and heart of popery. Though by reason of age, gray hairs are upon it, yet in comparison of true antiquity, it will appear that their head is both raw and green; and

if the head be young, the whole body cannot be old. The witnesses to give in their testimony of the minority of the pope, as head of the church, as now claimed, are at hand, even six several councils, which have so polled his head, and clipt his beard, that he looks very young, and bears his age marvelously well; for look upon him in the glass of true history, and no man will believe that he is so old as he brags to be.

My first catalogue of witnesses consists of three hundred and eighteen grave ancient fathers, assembled in the first general council, that ever was since the apostles' times, at Nice, in the year of our Lord 325. In reading over the canons of this council, I fix upon two, which are fully and directly against the pope's universal sovereignty and dominion over all churches; the one is against excommunicated persons appealing, in any diocese, to remote churches; or being harboured or received by them, in these words:—

“Concerning persons excommunicated, whether they be of the clergy or the laity, let this sentence be observed by the bishops of every province, according to the canon, which saith, that those who are cast out by some, shall not be admitted by others.”* This canon clips the power of the pope,

* Περὶ τῶν ἀκοινωνητῶν γενομένων, εἴτε τῶν ἐν κληρῷ, εἴτε τῶν ἐν λαϊκῷ ταγμασί τεταγμένων; ὑπο τῶν κατ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκοπῶν κρᾶνται ἡ γνώμη κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορευόντα, τοὺς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ὑποβληθέντας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσισθᾶναι. Codex Can Eccles. Univers. Can. 5.

and takes away his jurisdiction over other churches; and was plainly so understood of old, because when some were excommunicated in Africa, and ran to, and were entertained by the bishop of Rome, the council in Africa held it irregular, and wrote to the pope so too, and alleged this canon of the council of Nice, that he ought not to admit those whom they had excommunicated; of which more when I come to that council.

The other canon in this council runs: "Let the ancient customs continue in force, which are in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria have the government of all these; because also the bishop in Rome has the same custom. Likewise also in Antioch, and in other provinces, let the churches preserve their privileges."* From thus much of this canon, we easily learn: 1. That the bishop of Rome had not universal jurisdiction over all the churches; because the bishop of Alexandria was to have the same power, [ἐξουσίαν, authority] over those parts; and the bishop of Antioch, in those parts; and others, in other provinces, as the bishop of Rome had in those parts; which could not be, if the bishop of Rome were universal, and they provincial underlings; for there is not like

* Τα ἀρχαία ἐθὴ κράλειτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγυπτῷ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων εἶναι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; ἑπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπίσκοπῳ τούτο συνήθες ἐστίν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιοχείαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεία σωζέσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 6.

power, authority, or equality in a universal and a provincial bishop, according to their own doctrine.

2. We as easily see, that what power the pope had, is not by this council bottomed upon, and derived from the Holy Scriptures, or succession from Peter, but grounded only upon custom. Not a word is here, of any divine right to that power or place in which he then was, which was far inferior to what he claims and usurps now. For the first three hundred years, then, a universal head had not risen, nor was acknowledged in the church of God.

Secondly. The next catalogue of witnesses against the universal sovereignty of the bishop of Rome, has in it one hundred and fifty fathers, assembled at Constantinople, (which Caranza* says, is one of the four principal councils, and next after the council of Nice, whose authority is already alleged,) about the year 383. These, in their first canon, ratified and confirmed what was done in the Nicene council, and would have it to be observed without violation. Moreover, they decreed, "That no bishop of any diocese should go to any churches beyond their own bounds, to meddle with them, nor confound or mingle churches; but, according to the canons, the bishop of Alexandria should govern what belongs to Egypt; and the bishops of the East only the East, reserving the privileges by the canons of the council of Nice, to the church of Antioch; and the

* Caranza, p. 200.

bishops of the Asian diocese, should govern the Asian diocese only; and the bishops of the diocese of Pontus, what appertains to that diocese only; and so the bishops of Thrace, should in Thrace. And that no bishop of any diocese should go, except he be called to ordination, or any other church dispensations. This canon, above written, concerning dioceses, being kept, it is manifest that those things which appertain to each province, should be ordered by the synod of that province, [if they had said, *by the bishop of Rome, the universal head*, it would have made the papists' hearts to leap within them, and made his holiness smile; but, alas! they carried it quite another way, *by the synod of the province*,] according to the determinations of the Nicene council."* And in the next canon they decreed, "That the bishop of Constantinople, forasmuch as it is new Rome, should have the badges of honour next to the bishop of Rome."† From this general council, we

* Τους ὑπὲρ διοικήσιν ἐπισκοποὺς ταῖς ὑπερορίαις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιτείνειν, μηδὲ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκοποῦν τὰ ἐν Αἰγυπτίῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν; τοὺς δὲ τῆς ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκοποὺς, τὴν ἀνατολὴν μόνον διοικεῖν, φυλαττομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ Νικαίαν πρεσβείων τῇ Ἀντιόχειαν ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκοποὺς τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσιανὴν μόνον οἰκονομεῖν, &c. Φυλαττομένου δὲ τοῦ προγεγραμμένου περὶ τῶν διοικήσεων κανόνος εὐδήλον ὡς τὰ κατ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἢ τῆς ἐπαρχίας συνοδὸς διοικήσῃ κατὰ τὰ Νικαία ὀρίσμενα. Ibid. Can. 165. sed Concilii lib. Can. 2.

† Τὸν μὲντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπισκοποῦν εἶναι τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ρώμης ἐπισκοποῦν, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νεὰν Ρωμὴν. Ibid. Can. 166. aliter Can. 3.

learn: 1. That they vote against any one being universal head; because, 2. Every bishop was to govern in his own diocese, and no other was to meddle, except desired, with any ecclesiastical matters in another's province. 3. That the bishop of Constantinople is made equal with the bishop of Rome, save that his worship (I should have said lordship, but that they will not think high enough; but I cannot help it, these two councils forbid me to say *head*,) should sit in the first place, or before the other, which yet he might have done, without universal jurisdiction. 4. We learn that the honour which either of them had, was not bottomed upon divine right; but because they were bishops in the imperial cities. But here is not a word, "Thou art Peter," "Peter's successor," "apostolical seat." All this is very good evidence that the pope is not so old as to reach to the times of this council either.

Thirdly. The next catalogue of witnesses, that as yet the bishop of Rome was not universal head, consists of two hundred fathers, assembled in a general council at Ephesus, in the year 431; or as others, 434, or thereabouts. This council is so full, that I wonder how the papists, so many of them as have set forth so many volumes of councils, could with patience write what so much made against them, and yet go on in their error, challenging headship from the apostles' times. The canon declares the occasion of its constitution, in this manner: "Reginus, our fellow bishop, and beloved of God, together

with the holy bishops of the province of Cyprus, Zenon and Evagrius, have declared to us a new thing, contrary to ecclesiastical laws, and canons of the holy fathers, and that which concerns the liberty of all; wherefore, since common diseases need the greater medicine, for as much as they do the more harm, the ancient custom not being followed," to wit, this new thing was, "that the bishop of Antioch had ordained some in Cyprus, as some eminent for religion coming to the holy synod have both by writing and by their own words informed," wherefore it is decreed "that the presidents of the holy churches in Cyprus shall have this, without detriment and violation of their right, according to the canons of the holy fathers, and the ancient custom, themselves to ordain godly bishops; and this also shall be observed in other dioceses and provinces every where, that no bishop draw under his subjection any other province, which was not his from the beginning, or his predecessor's; and if any bishop has made such invasion, and by violence made it subject to him, he shall again restore it; that the canons of the fathers be not transgressed; lest under pretence of priesthood, the arrogance of worldly power creep in unawares, and we insensibly and by little and little lose that liberty which Jesus Christ our Lord, the Redeemer of mankind, has purchased for us with his own blood, and given freely to us. It seems good therefore to this holy and general synod, that the rights which they have

had from the beginning be secured to every province, pure and inviolable, according to the ancient custom; every metropolitan having liberty to take a copy of the acts for his own security. And if any one shall take a copy contrary in any thing to what is now determined, it pleased all the holy and universal synod that it should be void.”* Thus far this general council unanimously voted against one bishop’s meddling with or encroaching upon the provinces of others; calling it *a new thing*, &c. How then was one bishop owned as head over all the rest?

Fourthly. Another catalogue of six hundred and thirty, according to Caranza, assembled in a general council at Chalcedon in the year 451. In their first canon they ratify and confirm all the canons of the former councils, so that by the vote of these, they, to this year, are against the primacy and sovereignty

* Πραγμα παρα τους ἐκκλησιαστικούς θεσμούς και τους κανονας των ἁγίων καινοτομουμενον και της παντων ἐλευθερίας ἀπτομενον προσηγειλε, &c. Ὡστε τον ἐπισκοπον της Ἀντιοχείας πολέως, τας ἐν Κυπρῷ ποιεισθαι χειροτονίας, &c. Ἐξουσι το ἀνεπηρεαστον και ἀδίαστον οἱ των ἁγίων ἐκκλησιαν κατα την Κυπρον πρεσβυτατες κατα τους κανονας των ὁσίων πατερων και την αρχαιαν συνηδειν, δι’ ἑαυτων τας χειροτονίας των ἐυλαβεστατων ἐπισκοπων ποιουμενοι, το δε αὐτο και ἐπὶ των αλλων διοικησεων και των ἀπανταρχου ἐπαρχιων παραφυλαχθησεται, ὥστε μηδενα των θεοφιλεστατων ἐπισκοπων ἐπαρχιαν ἑτερην ουκ ουταν ανωθεν και ἐξάρχης ὑπο την αὐτου, ηγουν των πορο αὐτου χειρα, καλῶ λαμβανειν, ἀλλ’ εἰ και τις κατελαβεν και ὑφ’ ἑαυτω πεποιηται βιασαμενος τὸν ὅλον αποδιδουαι, ἵνα μη των παλῶρων οἱ κανονες παραβαινωνται, μηδε ἐν ἱερουργίας προσχηματι, ἐξουσίας κοσμικης τυφος παρεισδυηται, &c. Codex. Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 178. aliter Concil. Ephes. Can. 8.

of any one bishop. In another canon they determined, "That if any clergyman had any difference with his own, or another bishop, it should be tried by the synod of the province; but if there were any controversy betwixt a bishop, or clergyman, and the metropolitan of the province, he or they should go to the diocesan or to the seat of the royal city of Constantinople, and there have it tried."* So then appeals to Rome hereby are cut off; and the same is ratified again in another canon of the same council. Again, they decreed, "That the church of Constantinople should have equal privileges with Rome, that as the fathers before them had given the privilege to elder Rome, because it had the empire, so being moved by the same reason they gave the same privileges to Constantinople, new Rome, thinking it reason that the city which is honoured with the empire and senate, should be alike advanced with old Rome, in all ecclesiastical matters."† From whence it plainly follows: 1. That what privilege or precedency was given to Rome,

* Εἰ δὲ καὶ κληρικός παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔχῃ διαφορὰν πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον, ἢ καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον ἐπίσκοπον παρὰ τὴν συνόδον τῆς ἐπαρχίας διαζέσθω: εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μετροπολίτην, ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικός ἀμφισβητοῖν, καλᾶ λαμβανέτω, ἢ τὸν Ἐξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευσσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ διαζέσθω. Codex. Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 187. item Can. 195.

† Ταῖς ἰσὰς πρεσβείαις ἀπενείμαντο τῇ νεῇ Ῥώμῃ ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ εὐλογίας κρινούσας τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῶν ἰσῶν ἀπολαύουσας πρεσβείαν τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλυνεῖσθαι πράγμασι, &c. Codex can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 206.

was not by reason of Peter's supposed chair, but because it was honoured with empire; so that in the judgment of the ancients the pope had no divine right. 2. That the bishop of Constantinople was equal with the bishop of Rome in all things, as also were the metropolitans of the Asian, and Thracian dioceses, and of Pontus. Then at this time he was not yet universal bishop.

Fifthly. Another evidence in this cause is the council held at Antioch in the year 341, the occasion whereof was this. In the time of Julius I.* Bishop of Rome, in the Eastern church, several bishops were deposed for divers causes by their synods; which bishops went to Rome, and acquainted Julius with their whole estate and trouble. Julius writes to the bishops of the East, telling them, "They had done very ill to determine and conclude any thing against those bishops without his privity." When they received this, they took the correction of Julius for a contumely, or slander, and summoned a council at Antioch. There as soon as they had assembled together, they drew up an epistle by uniform consent of them all, wherein they bitterly inveigh against Julius, and signify withal, "That if any were banished the church and excommunicated by their decree and censure, it was not his part to intermeddle, nor to sit in judg-

* Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. 7. cap. 23, &c. et 36. Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 11.

ment upon their sentence.” And then decreed, “That if any bishop should be accused, and the matter could not be determined by the bishops of the province, some pronouncing the accused to be innocent, others to be guilty, for the taking up of the whole controversy, the metropolitan should call others to judge from the neighbouring province, and what should be so determined should stand firm.”* And in the next canon, they ratified, “That if any bishop was accused, and condemned by all the bishops of the province, and all should with one consent pronounce sentence against him; he should no more be tried by any other. But the sentence of the bishops of the province should be to all purposes valid.” Clearly do they take away all appeals to Rome, as the matter of the canons, and the occasion of making them fully demonstrate. And this council was confirmed in the sixth gene-

* 'Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τισὶν ἐγκλημασὶ κρινοίτο, ἐπειτα συμβαίη περὶ αὐτοῦ διαφανεῖν τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκοποὺς, τῶν μὲν ἁθῶν τὸν κρινόμενον ἀποφαίνοντων, τῶν δὲ ἐνοχόν, ὑπερ᾽ ἀπαλλαγῆς πάσης ἀμφισβήτησεως εἰδοξέ τι ἅγια συνοδῶ τὸν τῆς μητροπολεως ἐπίσκοπον, ἀπὸ τῆς πλησιοχωροῦ ἐπαρχίας μετακαλεῖσθαι ἑτέρους τινὰς τοὺς ἐπικρινούσας, καὶ τὴν ἀμφισβήτησιν διαλυόντας· τοῦ βεβαιῶσαι σὺν τοῖς τῆς ἐπαρχίας το παριστάμενον. Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 93. 'Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἐπὶ τισὶν ἐγκλημασὶ κατηγορηθεὶς, κριθεὶν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ ἐπισκοπῶν, πάντες τε συμφωνοὶ μίαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἐξενεγκοίεν ψήφον, τοῦτον μηκέτι παρ' ἑτέροις δικάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μένειν βεβαιοὺν τὴν συμφωνόντων ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκοπῶν ἀποφασιν. Codex Can. Eccles. Univers. Can. 94. apud Caranz. et Surium, Concil. Antiochen. Can. 14, 15.

ral Constantinopolitan synod held in Trul, and by pope Dionysius, and so has the authority of a general council and pope too; therefore, with the papists themselves, should be authentic. Caranz. Sum. Concil. p. 165. Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 24, et 25. Surius Concil. tom. I. pag. 399.

Sixthly. Another full evidence that the bishop of Rome was not owned as universal head, is the stout opposition made against it (in his early aspiring after it), by two hundred and seventeen fathers assembled, Augustine being one, and Aurelius president, in the year 419. The controversy then was this: Apiarius, a priest in Africa, was, for his scandalous life, excommunicated, in an African synod. Hereupon he fled to the bishop of Rome, who absolved him, and commanded him to be restored to his place; and Zosimus, bishop of Rome, to justify this, claimed a right to receive appeals from all parts of the world; and for proof thereof, pretended a certain canon of the Nicene council, that gave it him. The council, not finding any such canon in the decrees of the fathers at Nice, sent away letters and messengers to the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch, requesting them to send them the acts of the Nicene council, fast closed and sealed up, because they could not find a canon which was alleged by the legates of the bishop of Rome. From these they received several copies, all agreeing, but in none of them was found what Zosimus had affirmed to be in them; so that he was shame-

fully, by all the council, convinced of forgery; for the copies taken out of the originals by Cyril of Alexandria, and by Atticus of Constantinople, &c. had no such thing in them. Accordingly, the whole council writing to Boniface I., his successor, (in which letter they call Zosimus “a man of unhappy memory,”) desired him “to repel those that made him [the bishop of Rome] their refuge, both because there is no such constitution of the fathers, which so much derogated from the authority of the African church, as also because the Nicene council had evidently left the ordering of all inferiors to the judgment of their metropolitan, and had determined that all matters of controversy should receive their final decision in the place where they began. For how can a judgment given beyond the seas be good, where witnesses necessarily required in such cases, cannot be present, either on account of their sex, or age, or some other impediment? Because it is granted to every one to appeal to the councils of their own provinces, or to a universal council. Unless there should be any one that can think that our God can inspire a justice of trial into any one man, and deny it to innumerable priests that are assembled in council.” These letters of the council to Boniface, of Cyril of Alexandria to the council, and of Atticus of Constantinople to the same, and the copies of the Nicene council sent to them, and the epistle of the council to pope Celestine, are in the end of Codex Canon. Eccles. African. and in

Surius, tom. 1. p. 588, &c. Thus much for their letters; now for the canons of the African church against the headship of the bishop of Rome. In the 19th Canon: "If any bishop be accused, the accuser should bring his cause before the primate of the province." Can. 23. "That no bishop should go beyond the sea, unless he had the consent of the bishop of the first seat of every province." Can. 28. "That if presbyters,* deacons, and others, have complaint against their bishops, the neighbouring bishops should hear them; and if they would appeal from them, it should not be to the judgments of any beyond the sea, but to the primates of their own provinces, or to a general council, as was decreed before concerning bishops. As for those that shall appeal beyond the sea, none shall receive them into communion in Africa." So also Canon 125.

So far, we see that the church of God curbed and restrained the ambition of the bishop of Rome, and stoutly stood against the endeavours of aspiring antichrist. Yet will I add one more; and that is of a

* Ὅμοιος ηἴρεσεν, ἵνα οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διακονοὶ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κατώτεροι κληρικοὶ, ἐν αἷς ἐχῶσιν αἰτίαις, ἔαν τὰ δικαστήρια μεμφώμεται τῶν ἰδίων ἐπισκοπῶν, οἱ γειτονεὶς ἐπισκοποὶ ἀκροασώμεναι αὐτῶν: καὶ μετὰ συναίρεσεως τοῦ ἰδίου ἐπισκοποῦ, τὰ μέλαξυ αὐτῶν διαθῶσιν οἱ προσκαλούμενοι δι' αὐτῶν ἐπισκοποὶ, διό εἰ καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν παρῆεν νομισώσιν, μὴ ἐκκαλεσώμεναι εἰς τὰ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης δικαστήρια, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς πρωτεύοντάς τινων ἰδίων ἐπαρχιῶν, ὡς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπισκοπῶν πολλακίς ὥρισται: οἱ δὲ πρὸς περχμαλικά δικαστήρια διεκκαλούμενοι, παρὰ οὐδενος ἐν τῇ Ἀφρική δεχθῶσιν εἰς κοινωνίαν. Codex Can. Eccles. African. Can. 28.

council at Constantinople, in the time of Agatho, bishop of Rome, which was about the year 673, or as others, 681, who smartly snubbed the pretended mother, that is to give laws to all others, by making a law to extend to, and to bind the church of Rome, saying: "Forasmuch as we understand that in the city of Rome, in time of Lent, they fast upon the Sabbath days, contrary to the custom of the church, it is decreed in this synod, that also in the church of Rome, that canon shall be of force without violation, which saith, if any of the clergy shall be found fasting on the Lord's day, or Sabbath, except only one, let him be deposed; but if any one of the laity, let him be excommunicated."* This the church of Rome, in the height of her pride, would hardly brook; but you see, up to this time, many councils knew no such thing as a universal head, but opposed the first appearance of it.

To these evidences, from councils, I shall add further the expressed judgment of two of their own bishops, predecessors of him, who first got the title of universal head, viz: Pelagius and Gregory the Great, who exceedingly inveighed against this title;

* Quoniam intelleximus in Romanorum civitate, in sanctis quadragesimæ jejuniis, in ejus Sabbatis jejunare præter ecclesiasticam consuetudinem traditam; sanctæ synodo visum est, ut in Romanorum quoque ecclesia inconcussè vires habeat canon qui dicit: Si quis clericus inventus fuerit in sancto Dominico vel Sabbatho jejunans præter unum et solum, deponatur, sin autem laicus, segregetur. Surius in Concil: tom. 2. p. 1048. Concil. VI. Constant. Can. 55. refer autem ad Canon. Apostol. 66.

God in his providence so ordering it, that the following popes might be condemned out of the mouths of their predecessors. Their sharpness of speech against this usurpation, was occasioned by John bishop of Constantinople, surnamed the Faster, who assumed to himself the title of universal bishop about the year 580; about which time Pelagius II. being bishop of Rome, wrote to all the bishops assembled at Constantinople in a synod called by John the bishop of that seat, saying, "That they ought not to acknowledge John as universal bishop, unless they purposed to depart away from the communion of all other bishops:" moreover, saying, "Let no patriarch use such a title, for if the chief patriarch should be called universal, the name of a patriarch would be taken away thereby from all others; but God forbid it should ever enter into the heart of a Christian to assume any thing to himself, whereby the honour of his brethren should be debased. For this cause I, in my epistles, never call any by that name, for fear that by giving him more than is his due, I might seem to take away that which of right belongs to him. For the devil our adversary goeth about like a roaring lion, exercising his rage upon the humble and meek-hearted, and seeking to devour now, not the sheep-cotes, but the very principal members of the church. For he [John] comes near to him of whom it is written, 'This is he which is king over all the children of pride:' which words I speak with grief of mind, seeing our bro-

ther and fellow bishop John, in despite [mark his reasons against this head,] of the commandment of our Saviour, the precepts of the apostles, and canons of the church, by this haughty name, makes himself his [antichrist's] forerunner, and hereby goes about [mark reader,] to attribute to himself all those things which belong properly to the head himself, that is, Christ; and by the usurpation of this pompous title, to bring under his subjection all the members of Christ." And he warns them to beware, lest this temptation of Satan prevail over them, and that they neither give nor take this title of universal bishop.*

This is a large testimony against, and a full condemnation of both name and office of universal bishop, and this by a bishop of Rome, before his successor had usurped the same. And I might infer, either that the following bishops of Rome greatly err in taking to themselves this name and office, or else this bishop of Rome was fallible and erred in a matter of faith, made now by them necessary to salvation. Let them choose which alternative they will, for one they must; their principles are wounded by it.

* Nullus patriarcharum universalitatis vocabulo unquam utatur, quia si unus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur; sed absit hoc, absit à fidelis cujusquam mente, hoc sibi vel velle quempiam arripere, unde honorem fratrum suorum imminuere ex quantulacunque parte videatur, &c. Jus. Can. Dist. 99. Nullus Patriarcharum, Glos.

After this Pelagius (for the usurper was not immediately after him,) succeeded Gregory, called the Great, about the year 590, at which time John IV. of Constantinople, still persisted in claiming and maintaining his title of universal bishop; at which Gregory being much grieved and offended, writes to Constantia the empress against it; saying, “far be it that your time should be defiled by the exaltation of one man,” which he speaks of as “an insufferable thing; and that by this arrogancy and pride is portended that the time of antichrist is now at hand; and that John imitated him, [Lucifer] who making light of that happiness which he had in common with the other angels, would needs aspire to a singularity above all the rest.”* And writing to the

* *Triste tamen valde est, ut patienter feratur, quatenus despectis omnibus, prædictus frater et coëpiscopus meus solus conetur appellari episcopus. Sed in hac ejus superbia quid aliud nisi propinqua jam antichristi tempora designatur? quia illum videlicet imitatur, qui spretis in sociali gaudio angelorum legionibus, ad culmen conatus est singularitatis erumpere. Unde per omnipotentem dominum rogo, ne pietatis vestræ tempora permittatis unius hominis elatione maculari, neque tam perverso vocabulo ullum quoquo modo præbeatis assensum, &c. Gregor. Mag. ad. Constant. lib. 4. Epist. 34. Cunctis Evangelium scientibus liquet, quod Petrus universalis apostolus non vocatur, et vir sanctissimus consacerdos meus Johannes vocari universalis episcopus conatur; exclamare compellor, ac dicere, O tempora! O mores! et tamen sacerdotes, vanitatis sibi nomina expetunt, et novis ac prophanis vocabulis gloriantur, &c. Nullus Romanorum pontificum unquam hoc singularitatis vocabulum assumsit, nec uti consensit, &c. Quis est iste, qui contra statuta evangelica, contra canonum decreta, novum sibi usurpare nomen præsumit? Idem. ibid. ad Mauritium. Epist. 32.*

emperor, he says, "That all those who have read the gospel know well, that Peter [mark reader,] is not called the universal apostle, and yet behold, my fellow priest John seeks to be called the universal bishop. I am now forced to cry out, Oh the times! and Oh the manners of men! Europe is now exposed as a prey to the barbarian, and yet the priests who should lie along in the dust upon the pavement, weeping and rolling themselves in ashes, seek after names of vanity; and boast themselves of their new found [this is a novelty in the judgment of a bishop of Rome,] and profane titles." And in opposition to this pride of John, he was the first bishop of Rome who took this title, *the servant of servants*, which title his successors in feigned humility still use, though they usurp the title of universal bishop, in opposition to which he so styled himself, and in excessive pride have since added to themselves many pompous appellations. Again, says the same Roman bishop, "Now the king of pride is at the gates, and what I dread to speak, an army of priests and bishops stands ready to receive him." He calls it "a superstitious and haughty name of universal bishop," and adds, "Never may such foolery befall us; call a universal bishop, a universal enemy." And again, "I speak it boldly, that whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called by others, the universal bishop, is in his elation of mind, the forerunner of antichrist, because that in like pride he prefers himself before

others; for as that wicked one would seem as God, above all men, so will this man exalt himself above all bishops.” He plainly declares, “That none of the bishops of Rome ever assumed that word of singularity,” &c. And this same Gregory, writing to John of Constantinople, deals roundly and plainly with him, saying, “When thou wast called to the office of a bishop, thou saidst, That thou wast not worthy to be called a bishop, and now thou wouldst have none a bishop but thyself. What wilt thou answer unto Christ, who is the true head of the universal church, in that day of judgment, seeing that by this name of *universal* thou seekest to enthrall all the members of his body unto thyself? Whom dost thou imitate herein, save only him, who in contempt of those legions of angels, which were his fellows, sought to mount aloft to the top of singularity, where he might be subject to none, and all others subject to him?”*

But did he not raise all this stir, and make all this opposition, because John had anticipated him; because he had not this name and title himself?†

* Qui enim indignum te esse fatebaris, &c.—nec stulto ac superbo vocabulo appellari consentias,—ut cuncta brevi cingulo locutionis astringam: sancti ante legem, sancti sub lege, sancti sub gratia, omnes hi perficientes corpus Domini, in membris sunt ecclesiæ constituti, et nemo se unquam universalem vocare voluit, &c. Idem. ibid. ad Johan. Constantinop. Epist. 38.

† Nunquid ego, hac in re, piissime domine, propriam causam defendo? nunquid specialem injuriam vindico? et non magis

since as he is said to be the best of all the bishops of Rome that came after him, so the worst of all that were before him. Hear what he says, writing to Eulogius, bishop of Alexandria: "You have been careful to advertise me, that you forbear now to write to any by those proud names which spring merely from the root of vanity; and yet speaking to me, you say '*as you commanded.*' Let me, I pray you, hear no more of this word *command*; for I know well enough what I am, and what you are. In degree you are my brethren, and in manners you are my fathers: wherefore I *commanded* you nothing, only I advised you, what I thought fittest to be done; and yet I do not find that you have perfectly observed that which I desired to leave deepest graven in your remembrance; for I told you, that you should not write in any such manner either to me, or to any other, and yet in the very preface of your epistle, you call me by that name of pride and vanity, '*universal pope*;' which I would entreat you to forbear hereafter, seeing that yourselves lose, whatever you give unduly to another. For my part, I seek to increase in virtues, and not in vanity of titles. That adds nothing to my honour, which I see taken from my brethren. My honour is the honour of the universal church, and the sound vigour of my brethren. For if you call me universal pope, you deny yourselves to be that which in-

causam omnipotentis Dei et causam universalis ecclesiæ? Idem ad Maurit. Epist. 32.

deed you are, in that you call me universal. But God forbid, let us rather put far from us these words, which puff up pride and vanity, and wound charity to the death.”*

This is that Gregory, bishop of Rome, who was so vehement in his writing against the name and office of universal bishop, that after his death, the Romanists would have burnt his works, had not one Peter, a deacon, restrained them by affirming to them, “That he often saw the Holy Ghost, in the form of a dove, sitting upon the head of Gregory, while he was writing them.” This is that Gregory who so earnestly cried down a universal bishop, that pope Gregory XIII. could not answer, but by giving this Gregory the flat lie. (Plessæus.) But what follows from that learned authoritative confutation, but that the bishop of Rome is fallible, and may err? For if Gregory the Great spoke truth, then Gregory XIII. spoke false, in saying his doctrine was a lie. If Gregory XIII. spoke true, in saying the other lied, and that in a matter of faith made necessary to salvation, then Gregory the Great greatly erred, in a matter that concerned the universal church. Let them take which horn of the

* *Indicare vestra beatitudo studuit, &c. Nam dixi nec mihi vos, nec cuiquam alteri tale aliquid scribere debere, et ecce in præfatione epistolæ, quam ad meipsum qui prohibui, direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum, universalem me papam dicentes, imprimere curastis. Quod peto dulcissima mihi sanctitas vestra ultra non faciat, &c. Idem Epist. lib. 7. Epist. 30. See also lib. 4. Epist. 36. lib. 6. Epist. 5. 24. 28. 30, and 31.*

dilemma they will, their infallibility lies in the dust; for it will much puzzle his holiness to reconcile the parts of a contradiction.

I have been a little larger on this point, both from councils, and in transcribing the words of these two: 1. Because this is the main HEAD and hinge of our controversies. 2. Because these two were their own, and yet against them. 3. Because it makes it plain, that for six hundred years the bishop of Rome was not universal head, for at that time it was disclaimed by themselves, as you see.

But when was this title first assumed? and by whom was it first conferred upon the bishop of Rome, to be called universal?

You have been told before, that Gregory the Great wrote letters to Maurice, the emperor, in the controversy between him and John of Constantino-ple, about the name *universal*. This emperor, Maurice, falling into dislike among the soldiers, one Phocas, a centurion, made himself captain of the mutineers, and was afterwards by them proclaimed emperor. Maurice, seeing this, fled away with his wife and children. Phocas was crowned, and pursued after his own master, Maurice, overtook him, slew his wife and children, or some of them before his eyes, and afterwards caused him to be murdered also. Mark that this Phocas was a vile traitor, and a murderer of such an excellent emperor and virtuous man, as historians say, that Maurice was. A while after Phocas became emperor, Gregory,

bishop of Rome, who had opposed the title of universal head, departed out of this life, and Sabinian, a malicious detractor of Gregory and his works, succeeded him, and continued bishop of Rome scarce two years; after whom succeeded Boniface III., about the year 605, who lived not (as some say) above eight months, or as others, but a year, after he was bishop of Rome. But, in that time, he obtained what he aimed at; for the murder committed by Phocas upon the emperor Maurice, being not approved of by the bishop of Constantinople, Phocas sought to establish himself in the empire, gotten by blood, by the friendship of the bishop of Rome. Boniface, making great offers of his service to Phocas, took this opportunity to desire of him, that he and his successors after him, should be called universal head of all the churches of Christ, and that the church of Rome thenceforward should have the pre-eminence, and be head of all other churches. The terms were agreed upon. The murderer, Phocas, was confirmed in his usurpation, and the aspiring Boniface received the title of universal bishop of all Christian churches. And this is acknowledged by their own historians.*

From all which, you clearly see, that it was not till after the six hundredth year from Christ, that

* Quo tempore intercesserunt quædam odiorum fomenta inter eundem Phocam imperatorem atque Cyriacum Constantinopolitanum. Hinc igitur in Cyriacum Phocas exacerbatus in ejus odium imperiali edicto sancivit, nomen universalis decere Ro-

the bishop of Rome had this title conferred upon him; and that he came not to it by divine right, not made so by God, nor called and chosen to it by a general council of fathers, but by a traitor and a murderer. The pope giving his help to keep the usurper in the saddle, by way of requital, this wicked and tyrannical emperor lifts the pope up into the chair. *Par nobile fratrum!*

As his name and office of universal bishop is new, so are those other accumulative, pompous, and some of them blasphemous titles, not fit to be given to any mortal man. For of old, it was not so; for Peter, whose successor he pretends to be, had no such names nor titles, but styled himself a fellow presbyter, 1 Peter v. 1. And the canons of the African church of old were, that “the bishop of the first seat [that was Rome,] should not be called prince of priests, or head priest, or any such like name, but only the bishop of the first seat.”* Caranza,† in his annotations upon this canon, says:

manam tantum modo ecclesiam, tanquam quæ caput esset omnium ecclesiarum, solique convenire Romano pontifici; non autem episcopo Constantinopolitano, qui sibi illud usurpare præsumeret. Quod quidem hunc Bonifacium papam tertium ab imperatore Phoca obtinuisse, cum Anastasius Bibliothecarius, tum Paulus diaconus tradunt. Spondan, Epitom. Baron. Annal. in annum 606.

* Ὡστε τον της πρώτης καθεδρας ἐπισκοπον μη λεγισθαι εξαρχον των ἱερων η ακρον ἱερα, η τοιούτο τροπον τι ποτε, ἀλλα μονον ἐπισκοπον της πρώτης καθεδρας. Codex Canon. Eccles. Afric. Can. 39.

† Caranz. Sum. Concil. Carthag. 3. Can. 26.

“That the African church could not give laws to the universal church, and therefore by this canon neither did nor could forbid the calling of the bishop of Rome, prince of priests,” &c. But they could decree, that they would never call him so, nor own him for such, which shows that by them he was not so advanced. But their own canon law* forbids that the bishop of Rome should be called universal. And the sixth council at Constantinople,† ratifying the decree of the 150 fathers formerly assembled in that city, and of the 630 fathers assembled at Chalcedon, also agreed with them and decreed, “That the bishop of Constantinople should have equal privilege with the bishop of Rome, and have equal power in all ecclesiastical matters with him, only that he be the second to the bishop of Rome; and after the bishop of Constantinople, the bishop of Alexandria should have the next seat; and next to him, the bishop of Antioch; and next to him, the bishop of Jerusalem.” By all which appears that the bishop of Rome was not head of all the rest, the prince of priests, but that all the respect that he had above the rest, was to sit down in the first seat, which is nothing at all to his universal jurisdiction; and then he had not those titles that now are given to him; 1. As head over all priests,

* Nec etiam Romanus pontifex universalis est appellandus. Distinct. 99. c. nec etiam.

† Surius in Concil. tom. 2. pag. 1046. Concil. Constantinop. Can. 36.

as a king is over his judges; 2. The vicar of St. Peter, though now they say, not the vicar of Peter properly, but vicar of Christ properly, and successor of Peter; 3. Most mighty priest; 4. That he has all laws in his breast; 5. Chief magistrate of the whole world; 6. That his sacerdotal dignity as far excels kings and emperors, as gold excels lead; 7. That all the earth is his diocese, and he the ordinary of all men, having the authority of the King of all kings upon subjects—that he is all in all, and above all; 8. “If those things that I do, be said to be done not of man but of God, what can you make of me but a god? and the prelates of the church being accounted of Constantine for gods, I, being above all prelates, by this reason am above all gods.”*

Likewise the power of the pope over general councils is a new power. It was not so of old; he had not the power of calling councils, but it belonged to, and was done by civil magistrates. The first general council of Nice, was assembled by the authority of Constantine the Great; the second, at Constantinople, was called by Theodosius the elder; the third, at Ephesus, by Theodosius the younger; the fourth, at Chalcedon, by Valentinian and Mar-

* Jus Canonic. 1. Dist. 96. c. ego. c. Constantinus. 2. Distinct. 63. 3. Juris Canon. pars 2. caus. 25. quest. 1. c. null. 4. Romanus pontifex, qui jura omnia in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere—Sexti. decret. p. Bonifac. 8. c. licet. 5. Decret. lib. 6. Bonifac. 8. in proœmio. 6. Distinct. 96. c. duo. 7. Glos. in c. 11. quest. 3. si mimicus. 8. Decret. de Translat. Episc. cap. quinto.

cian, &c. Historians tell us, that when once the emperors began to be Christians, from that time forward the church affairs depended upon them, and the greatest councils were assembled, and so still are, at their appointment. So Socrates.* And in the council of Constance, (which Caranza† says was general, held A. D. 1400, and which deposed three popes, Gregory XII., Alexander V., John XXIV.) and again in the council of Basil, which began in the year 1431, it was decreed, “That a synod has its power immediately from Christ, to which every one, of what state soever or dignity he be, yea, even the pope himself ought to be obedient, which if he be not, but shall contumaciously condemn the decrees, statutes, and ordinances of the council, except he repent, he shall suffer condign punishment, though it be the pope himself.”‡ And this council of Constance was confirmed by pope Martin V., Sess. 45. and the other at Basil, by pope Nicolas V.

From all this it appears, that the main essential point of popery is a mere novelty, not having originated till after the sixth century after Christ, and not attained to its full power till several hundred years after this. So that I may with Voetius, con-

* Eccles. Hist. lib. 5. præm.

† Caranz. Sum. Concil. p. 824, 825.

‡ Primo declarat synodus, quod ipsa potestatem à Christo immediatè habet, cui quilibet cujuscunque statûs vel dignitatis, etiam si papalis existat, obedire tenetur, &c. Conc. Constan. Sess. 4, 5. et Conc. Basil. Sess. 2. 16. 18.

fidently affirm, that in the first six centuries, there was NO CHURCH, NO ONE DOCTOR, NO ONE MARTYR, NO CONFESSOR, NO ONE FAMILY, NO, NOR ONE MEMBER OF THE CHURCH, EITHER IN THE WEST, OR IN ANY OTHER PART OF THE WORLD, THAT WAS PROPERLY AND FORMALLY A PAPIST. What is then become of the ANTIQUITY of POPERY? for there cannot be so much as one formal papist, where the essentials of popery are not; as where the essentials of a man are not, there is no man actually existent. But the pope, as universal head, is an essential part of the popish religion, without which (according to their doctrine) the church is no church, nor any one a member thereof, that does not own him and submit to him. Therefore the pope not being till after the sixth century, so long there was not one papist, formally and properly, in the whole world!

This being the main pillar of popery, I have insisted the longer to prove the novelty of it; for this falling, the whole fabric tumbles down: as therefore it is not necessary that I should be so large in the rest, I shall but name what follows.

Secondly. The forbidding of ministers' marriage is a mere novelty. For as their own authors say, Syricius* bishop of Rome, who lived about the year 388, was the first that forbad it; yet it was not then

* Syricius primus sacerdotibus et diaconis circiter annum salutis 388, conjugio interdixit—Non ante pontificatum Gregorii VII. Anno 1074, connubium adimi sacerdotibus occidentalibus potuit. Polyd. Virg. de Invent. rer. lib. 5. cap. 4.

received and practised as a duty for them to abstain from marriage, but liberty of marrying was never denied them till Gregory VII. came to be pope in 1074, who yet was resisted, as one that brought in a new custom, never received before; and the bishops of Italy,* Germany and France met together, and for this decreed that he had acted against Christian piety, and deposed him, because among other things, he had divorced men from their wives, denying such as had their lawful wives to be priests; when yet at the same he admitted to the altars, whoremongers, adulterers and incestuous persons.

Bellarmino himself and other popisht doctors grant, yea, he proves by arguments, that by the law of God it is not forbidden that ministers should marry, and that for many hundred years the church of Rome permitted Greek priests to have and dwell with their wives.

Thirdly. That religious worshipping of images has not been of old in the church of God, nor received and owned by councils, (for what particular persons and heretics in this point have done is not in this controversy so much to be minded) nor practised in the church for some hundred years after Christ, there is sufficient evidence. Bishop Usher in his answer to the Jesuit's challenge, says:

* Magdeb. cent. 11. pag. 389.

† Aquin. 2 da. 2 dæ. Q. 88. art. 11. Cajet. Opuscul. tom. 1. Tract. 27. Sotus lib. 7. de Justitia Q. 6. art. 2. in Bellar. de Cleric. lib. 1. cap. 18.

It might well be concluded that images were brought into the church partly by lewd heretics, partly by simple Christians newly converted from paganism. The Gnostic heretics had images, some painted in colours, others framed of gold and silver, and other matter, which they said were the representations of Christ, made under Pontius Pilate, when he was conversant here among men; and though Eusebius* makes mention of the images of Paul and Peter, and of Christ, yet there he calls it "a heathenish custom." But they were so far from worshipping them in the primitive times, that a council† of ancient fathers decreed about the year 325, "That pictures ought not to be in the church, lest that which is worshipped or adored, should be painted on walls." Which law made by this council, set Melchior Canus,‡ the papist, in such a heat, that he alone would condemn them all, not only of imprudence but impiety for so doing, for the poor man could not otherwise answer it.

In the first four general councils, which reached to the year 451, there is nothing for the worshipping of images, and yet if they had been of that opinion, they had had occasion from what was done in the Elibertine council, being about the

* Euse. Eccl. Hist. l. 7. c. 18.

† Concil. Elibertin.

‡ Illa lex non imprudenter modo, verum etiam impie, à concilio Elibertino lata est de tollendis imaginibus. Canus loc. theolog. lib. 5. cap. 4. conclus. 4.

same time that the Nicene council was, and before the other three. And it should seem that they were not worshipped in the church of Rome itself, for six hundred years after Christ, by the epistle of Gregory the Great to Serenus bishop of Marseilles,* who had broken down images, and cast them out of his church, when he perceived some to begin to dote upon them too much. Though he reproves him for breaking them, yet he commends him for his zeal, and says, “that nothing made with hands should be worshipped—that though the people might have had them, whereby to gather the knowledge of the history, yet they might not sin in worshipping the picture.” Judge if it were likely that at that time religious worship was given to images at Rome, when the bishop thereof condemned it as a sinful thing, and commends others for being against it. And though cardinal Bellarmine was of opinion, “That it is lawful to picture God in the church in the shape of a man, and the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove,” yet a greater and one more ancient than he, was against it, namely, pope Gregory II. whose epistle is quoted by Baronius, upon the year 726,

* Indico dudum ad nos pervenisse quod fraternitas vestra quosdam imaginum adoratores aspiciens, easdem ecclesiæ imagines confregit atque projecit, et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari possit, habuisse laudavimus. Tua fraternitas, ab earum adoratione populum prohibere debuit; et populus in picturæ adoratione minime peccaret. Greg. Mag. Epis. lib. 7. Ep. 109.

whence it seems there was no such picture in the church of Rome at that time; for, says that pope, "In the church, God is not represented before men's eyes, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is not drawn in colours, because God's nature cannot be painted out, or put in sight."*

Moreover, at a council of 338 fathers, held at Constantinople, in the year 754, they were solemnly condemned; and when they were set up by the second council at Nice, in the year 787, they were degraded again of their honour by the council of Francfort in the year 794.

Durant purposely sets himself to give us all the councils that have approved the use and veneration of images;† and says, the first that did so was the sixth council at Constantinople, (which was in the time of pope Agatho, about the year 673,) and quotes the 83d, but it is the 82d canon,‡ where the picture of Christ is commanded to be made in the shape of a man; but turning to the place, I find plainly that this canon does not at all command any

* *Cur tandem Patrem Domini Jesu non oculis subjicimus ac pingimus? quoniam quis sit non novimus, Deique natura spectanti proponi non potest ac pingi.*

† Durant. de ritib. p. 31.

‡ *Christi Dei nostri instar hominis characterem etiam in imaginibus deinceps pro veteri agno statui jubemus, ut per ipsum verbi Dei humiliationem mente comprehendentes, ad memoriam quoque ejus in carne conversationis, ejusque passionis, et salutaris mortis deducamur, ejusque quæ ex eo facta est mundo redemptionis. Conc. Constant. VI. Can. 82.*

worship to be given to it, but only recommends the use of it, as an aid to the memory, which is nothing to the popish cause of worshipping images. He next refers to a second Nicene council, which yet was 787 years after Christ, so that this might pass for a novelty.

Fourthly. The doctrine of purgatory, by the confession of papists themselves, is ranked among the novelties brought into the church; for one of them says, "No true believer now doubts of purgatory, whereof notwithstanding among the ancients there is very little or no mention at all. The Greeks also, to this day, do not believe that there is a purgatory. Let who will read the commentaries of the ancient Greeks, and so far as I see, he shall find very rare mention of purgatory, or none at all. And the Latins did not all of them together receive the truth of this matter, but by little and little; neither indeed was the faith either of purgatory or pardons so needful in the primitive church, as it now is."* Thus far a papist, and an ingenuous one too, though it is rare to find one that will without partiality speak the truth; which Bellarmine does not use to do, for he says quite the contrary, "That all the fathers, both Greek and Latin, have constantly taught from the apostles' times that there is a pur-

* *Nemo certe dubitat orthodoxus, an purgatorium sit, de quo tamen apud priscos, nulla vel quàm rarissima fiebat mentio; sed et Græcis ad hunc usque diem, non est creditum esse, &c.* Johan. Ross. apud Polyd. Virg. de Invent. Rerum, lib. 8. cap. 1.

gatory.”* And this cardinal is so zealous for the doctrine of purgatory, that he says, “That it is a doctrine of faith, so that he who does not believe it, shall never come to it, [no harm if he do not, I suppose; it is no desirable thing to be in pains, no less than the pains of hell, though shorter,] but shall be always tormented in the flames of hell.” But the best of it is, that it is but a cardinal, not the Scripture that says so. But I will set another papist against Bellarmine, and standing between the two, let him shift for himself, and get out as well as he can. These are the words of Alphonsus, “Concerning purgatory, there is almost no mention made by the ancients, especially the Greek writers, for which reason to this very day, the Greeks do not believe that there is a purgatory.”† It is true that many of the fathers speak of a purgatorial fire, both in this life, and after; but by the fire in this life they understand afflictions. So Augustine, “We confess that in this life there are purgatory pains,—as loss of friends, and the calamities of this life.”‡ So also, by a purging fire after this life, through which they make all saints to pass, they understand the last day of judgment. But the popish purgatory is another thing, not invented in the days of Gregory I., who wrote in the end of the sixth age,

* Bellar. de Purgat. lib. 1. cap. 15.

† Alphons. de Castro, Advers. Hæres. lib. 8. titul. Indulgentia.

‡ August. de Civitat. Dei, lib. 22. cap. 13.

saying, "Because we are redeemed by the grace of our Creator, we have the heavenly gift, that when we are withdrawn from the habitation of our flesh, we are presently brought to the heavenly recompense."* And though in the writing of this pope there is some mention of purgatory for smaller sins, yet it is not the same that the papists now assert; for in his dialogues he speaks of the purgation of souls in baths, in rivers, and wind; and it was first bottomed upon visions and revelations, and feigned stories of departed souls appearing to others in this life.

But above 200 years after these pretended visions, the council of Aquisgran† show that this was not a generally received doctrine, for they sum up all the punishments inflicted by God for sin to this life, and they mention two ways; "but the third," say they, "after this life, is very fearful and terrible, which by the most just judgment of God shall be executed, when he shall say, 'depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.'"

And yet further to discover the novelty of purgatory, that it was above a thousand years the opinion of some men only, and not an article

* *Quia auctoris nostri gratia redempti sumus, hoc jam cœlestis muneris habemus, ut cum à carnis nostræ habitatione subtrahimur, mox ad cœlestia præmia ducamur. Gregor. 1. in Job 20.*

† *Capit. Aquisgran. Conc. ad Papinum Miss. lib. 1. cap. 1. quoted by bishop Usher, Answ. to Jes. Chall. p. 177.*

of faith generally received, the saying of Otto Frigensis, writing in the year of our Lord 1146, gives evidence. His words are these, "That there is in hell a place of purgatory, wherein such as are to be saved are either only troubled with darkness or decocted with the fire of expiation, **SOME AFFIRM.**"* Mark reader, all did not teach so, nor the most, but some only.

Fifthly. That the pope's indulgences are a mere novelty, of which the church of God for many hundred years knew nothing, we need look for no further evidence, than the plain confession of papists themselves, amongst whom I find Alphonsus making plain and full confession, about these indulgences and pope's pardons, saying, "That of all the matters treated of in his whole book, there is not one of which the Scripture is more silent, not one that the ancient writers speak less of."† Though

* *Esse apud inferos locum purgatorium, in quo salvandi vel tenebris tantum afficiantur, vel expiationis igne decoquantur, QUIDAM afferunt. Otto Frig. lib. 8. Chro. c. 26. apud eundem.*

† *Inter omnes res de quibus in hoc opere disputamus, nulla est quam minus aperte sacræ literæ prodiderint, et de qua minus vetusti Scriptores dixerint, neque tamen hac occasione sunt condemnandæ [indulgentiæ quod earum usus in ecclesia videatur sero receptus: quoniam multa sunt posterioribus nota, quæ vetusti illi Scriptores prorsus ignoraverunt. Quid ergo mirum si ad hunc modum contigerit de indulgentiis, ut apud priscos nulla sit de eis mentio? Etsi pro indulgentiarum approbatione sacræ Scripturæ testimonium apertum desit, tamen qui contemnit, hæreticus merito censeatur, &c. Alphons. de Castro. Adver. Hæres. lib. 8. titul. Indulgentia.*

he would not have them “therefore to be slighted, because the use of them has been but lately received, because [mark what he says,] many things are known to posterity, which the ancient writers were altogether ignorant of. What need we wonder then, if this be so in the matter of indulgences that among the ancients there is no mention of them at all?” Really this did me good to read, for I like that men should be ingenuous, and speak the plain truth. Yet when I read further, and saw that, though he acknowledges there is nothing for it in the Scripture, nor in the ancient fathers, yet he says that those who “set light by them, or despise them, should be judged heretics,” I thought his zeal had carried him too far. This papist makes no attempt at all to go higher than pope Gregory I., in the latter end of the sixth century, when he says, “It is said that he granted some indulgences;” and from thence he slides as far as the Lateran council, which was in the year of our Lord 1215, according to Caranza, and from thence to the council of Constance under pope John XXIV., which was after the year of our Lord 1400. And this is all the antiquity that he pretends to, from whose confession, we might safely place this among the *young* doctrines and practices held and used in the church of Rome.

But let us try another of them whose business in his book is to give the first rise, and beginning of things. He also does not attempt to rise higher

than the sixth century, to the former Gregory; but there he finds little to fasten upon, and therefore steps presently back to Boniface VIII., who he says was the first that brought in the popish jubilee, when he gave pardons to those that visited the apostles' temples, in the year 1300, which jubilee he commanded should be observed every hundredth year. But when fifty years were almost expired, pope Clement VI. ordained this jubilee should be every fiftieth year, forasmuch as man's age would not reach the hundredth year. Lastly, pope Sixtus IV. about 1471, or, as my present author, 1475, brought it to every twenty-fifth year; "and then [I pray the reader to mark] the use of pardons, which they call indulgences, began to be famous, which pardons, for what cause, or by what authority they were brought in, or what they are good for, much troubles our modern divines to show."* Reader,

* Bonifacius VIII.—primus omnium jubileum retulit, anno qui fuit MCCC salutis humanæ, quo pœnarum remissionem iis præstabat, qui limina apostolorum visitassent. Idem autem pontifex jubileum centesimo quoque anno servari mandavit. Quinquagesimo post instante anno Clemens VI. sanxit jubileum quinquagesimo quoque anno, cum ætas hominis vix jubileum illum centum annorum attingere possit. Postremo Sixtus ejus appellationis quartus jubileum ad vigesimum quemque annum reduxit, primusque celebravit, qui fuit annus MCCCCLXXV salutis, ac ita veniarum quas indulgentias vocant, jam tum usus celebris esse cæpit, quæ qua de causa, quave ex autoritate introductæ fuerint, aut quantum valere videantur, nostri recentiores theologi ea de re egregie laborant; ego vero originem, quod

is not this a plain case? Can we desire clearer evidence of the novelty of the pope's pardons, by which he beguiles so many souls, and gets so much money into his treasury? Being so much in the dark himself, he consults another to seek relief; and the third says, "It may be many will put no great trust in these indulgences, because their use is but lately come into the church, and is so found but a little while ago; to whom I say, it is not certain who first began them; there was, however, **SOME** very ancient use of them;"* but of this he speaks doubtingly, and gathers it only by inference. But this popish author whom we cited before, confessing the novelty of purgatory, concludes from thence the novelty of popish pardons; for, says he, "As long as there was no fear of purgatory, no man sought indulgences, for all the account of indulgence depends on purgatory. If you deny purgatory, what need of indulgences? Indulgences began after men were frightened with the pains of purgatory."† Thus,

mei est muneris, quæritans, non reperio ante fuisse, quod sciam, quam divus Gregorius ad suas stationes id præmii proposuerit. Polydor Virgil. de Invent. Rerum lib. 8. cap. 1.

* Multos fortasse movet indulgentiis istis non usque adeo fidere, quod earum usus in ecclesia videatur recentior, et admodum sero apud Christianos repertus, quibus ego respondeo, non certo constare à quo primum tradi cœperint, fuit tamen, nonnullus earum usus, ut aiunt, apud Romanos vetustissimus, quod ex stationibus intelligi potest.

† Quamdiu nulla fuerat de purgatorio cura, nemo quæsit indulgentias, nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum existima-

out of the mouths of these three witnesses of their own, we might let this pass for one of the *younger* sort, and set it amongst its fellows.

Sixthly. I may conclude the same of prayer for the dead; for if purgatory be but a late device, and indulgences granted for their deliverance be but late, prayer for them to be delivered out of purgatory, (which is supposed in the manner of the papists' prayers for departed souls) cannot be of a longer standing, as their bishop before quoted rightly argued.

What might be alleged for the antiquity of praying for the dead, used indeed in the church formerly, is nothing to the popish prayers used now; for it is most evident, that they did not pray in relation to their being in purgatory, which they understood not, nor do their prayers express any such thing, but rather the contrary, of their being at rest, which they could not have in purgatory. Therefore, whatsoever prayers they were, or to what end, is not my work at present to inquire. Until they be proved to be such as popish prayers for the dead, the latter will stand still among the *younger* practices of the church of Rome.

Seventhly. As for the novelty of praying to saints, cardinal Du Perron (a man that would have

tio. Si tollas purgatorium, quorsum indulgentiis opus erit? Cœperunt igitur indulgentiæ, postquam ad purgatorii cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum est. Johan. Roffen. in Luther. ibid.

found it, if there had been any such practice in the primitive churches) freely acknowledges, as Molineus who traced him in his book affirms, that “as in the Holy Scriptures there is neither command nor example for the invocation of saints; so likewise in the writings of the fathers, that have written before the first four councils, [which brings us to the year 451] no trace is to be found of that invocation.”* The distinction between the saints’ intercession, and the invocation of saints, should be carefully heeded; for whether the saints in heaven pray *for* the church on earth, and whether the church on earth might pray *to* the saints in heaven, are widely different questions. That in the first ages it was accounted idolatry to invoke angels, was determined in the thirty-fifth canon of the Laodicean council before quoted.

8. To show the novelty of transubstantiation;—that the bread is not turned into the flesh of Christ, I need not stand long: for Scotus does it for me, who says: “That this was not a doctrine of faith, before the Lateran council;”† which was in the year 1215. Bellarmine takes notice of this, and is offended at, and helps the matter as well as he can, by mentioning one council, (and he names no more, which he would have done, doubtless, if he could,) and that is a council at Rome under Gregory VII., who was pope in the year 1073; so that according

* Molin. Novelty of Popery, pag. 388.

† Bellar. de Euchar. lib. 3. cap. 23.

to Bellarmine's grave admonition of Scotus, it was above a thousand years before that was made a doctrine of faith in the Roman church itself. But Alphonsus, as to councils, rises no higher than the Lateran, as Scotus did.*

9. The denying of the cup to the people might be reckoned with the rest, for a mere novelty, having its rise in the council of Constance, which began in the year 1414; and there needs no other evidence, that this is an innovation, than the very words of the canon, whereby it is denied to the people, which are: "Although Christ administered this sacrament in both kinds, and though in the primitive church the people received it in both kinds, yet this custom is rationally introduced, that the people shall only take the bread; and we command, under pain of excommunication, that no presbyter give it to the people under both kinds of bread and wine."† Thus, though Christ appointed *both*, though the primitive times observed *both*, yet these arrogant priests say they shall have but *one*, any thing in Christ's command, and the church's practice, for so many hundred years, to the contrary,

* Alphons. de Castro adver. hæres. tit. Euchar. heres.

† Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum, et similiter licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala, est rationabiliter introducta,—quod à laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur, &c. Concil. Constan. Sess. 13.

(*non obstante*) notwithstanding; for this it was called deservedly by one *Concilium Non-obstantiense*, instead of *Constantiense*. And yet after this, the council of Basil granted the use of the cup to the Bohemians; and again the council of Trent denied it; so that *infallible* popish councils can say and unsay, do and undo, and that in matters of faith.

10. The adoration of the sacrament was after the doctrine of transubstantiation; for the reason of their worshipping of it, is because it is changed into Christ's body and blood. The first then being new, the other cannot be old. The first was brought in as an article of faith, in the time of Innocent III., in the year 1215; and the worshipping of it, in the time of Honorius III., in the year 1216.* Behold its antiquity!

11. The practice of the pope's canonizing of saints, is a new invention, by the confession of Bellarmine himself,† who acknowledges that the first pope that he ever read of, as canonizing saints, was Leo III., 800 years after Christ. And the same cardinal says: "That no saints might be publicly invoked, who are not canonized by the pope." Put both together, and it will make a clear consequence, that invocation of saints, at least publicly,

* Decret. Greg. IX. lib. 3. tit. 41. cap. 10.

† Primus pontifex (ni forte fallor) qui sanctos legatur canonizasse, videtur fuisse Leo papa III.; antequam fortasse fuerunt aliæ, sed non mihi constat. Bellar. de Sanct. Beat. lib. 1. cap. 8.

was not for 800 years after Christ, by the confession of the papists themselves.

But whither do I tend? To run over all particulars controverted between us and them, would sooner swell into a folio, than be contained in a small duodecimo. I can therefore but name some other points, and defy the papists to show, that for five, six, seven hundred, yea, some for a thousand years after Christ, they were generally owned or received in the church of Christ.

12. The infallibility of the bishop of Rome.

13. That the church of Rome is the only church, founded by God himself, or that the church of Rome is the catholic church.

14. That there is no salvation out of the Roman church.

15. That all that the church of Rome delivers is to be believed, whether it be written in the word of God, or not.

16. That the pope, or church of Rome, has power and authority to make doctrines of faith, necessary to salvation, that are not contained in the Scripture.

17. That the pope of Rome alone, or his council alone, or pope and council together, are the judge of controversies, to whom appeals from all the churches must be made, and in whose decisions all are bound to acquiesce.

18. That the pope of Rome might judge all, but be judged by none, nor be blamed, though he should lead souls by troops to hell.

19. That the pope of Rome has temporal jurisdiction over princes, kings, and emperors, to depose them from their thrones, dispose of their crowns, and absolve their subjects from their oaths of allegiance to their lawful princes.

20. That the pope of Rome has authority to dispense with the law of God; to make that lawful which God forbids, and that evil which God commands.

21. That the power of calling general councils is inherent in the pope.

22. That the pope by himself, or legates, ought to be president in such councils.

23. That all that general councils determine without his authoritative ratification, is of no force, but void.

24. That the Scripture is imperfect and insufficient, not containing in it all things necessary to salvation, nor for the refuting of all heresies.

25. That it is not lawful to interpret Scripture, contrary to the sense of the church of Rome.

26. That the church does not depend upon the Scripture, but the authority of the Scripture, even *quoad nos*, upon the testimony of the church of Rome.

27. That the Scripture ought not to be translated into the vulgar tongue.

28. That the common people are to be debarred from reading the Scriptures, except they have a license from the bishop.

29. That the public service and prayers in the church, ought to be in an unknown tongue.

30. That there are seven proper sacraments, baptism, confirmation, Lord's supper, penance, extreme unction, matrimony, ordination. Or that there are eight sacraments of order, as the order of porters, readers, exorcists, servitors, sub-deacons, deacons, presbyters and bishops; which make indeed fourteen or fifteen sacraments.

31. That the sacrament of confirmation is more worthy than the sacrament of baptism, and is to be had in greater reverence, and accordingly to be administered only by a bishop, when baptism may be administered by a presbyter, or a layman.

32. That private masses are lawful, and in them both clergy and laity are to be deprived both of the bread and wine, except the priest who makes it, while by the rest it may only be seen.

33. That the eucharist, when it is sent to the sick, is to be adored by all that meet it, and those that do not, are to be accounted heretics, and to be persecuted with fire and sword.

34. That the mass is a sacrifice for the quick and the dead, for obtaining not only spiritual but temporal blessings, to be offered to God for health, for success in battles, &c., &c.

35. That a justified person may truly and properly make satisfaction to God for the guilt of punishment, which remains to be expiated after the fault is remitted.

36. That the satisfactory works of the saints may be communicated and applied to others; or that there are works of supererogation.

37. That absolution by a priest is so necessary to salvation that persons believing in Christ are damned, if they die before they are absolved by a priest.

38. That the confirmation of bishops, and institution of archbishops by the pall are to be sought from the pope of Rome, from all parts of the world; without which they are no such officers, and none can without sacrilege execute their office.

39. That in baptism there is an implicit vow of obedience to the pope of Rome.

40. That the decretal epistles are to be reckoned amongst canonical scripture.

41. That the bishop of Rome, if he be canonically ordained, whatever his previous character, is undoubtedly made holy by the merits of St. Peter.

42. That every transgression of the law does not deserve death, but that there are many sins of themselves and in their own nature venial and deserving pardon; that the blood of Christ is not necessary to wash them away, but they may be done away with holy water, by smiting the breast, and by the bishop's blessing.

43. That clergymen are exempted from the jurisdiction of temporal rulers in things civil and criminal, and that the civil judge cannot punish ecclesiastical persons.

44. That the rebellion of a clergyman against a heretical king is not treason, or that it is meritorious to kill princes excommunicated by the pope.

45. That good works in themselves have a proportion, and condignity with the reward, and are meritorious from their inward worthiness, so as to merit a reward, as a journeyman does his wages for his labour.

Papists themselves acknowledge that the first beginning of some of their doctrines they cannot tell, and to search for the year when every novelty was introduced is needless. Those enumerated above, are not found in Scripture, nor in the primitive church, some not for four, five, some not for six, seven, eight, nine, and even twelve centuries after Christ. Hence I conclude that popery is a very novelty, and vainly and falsely boasts of its antiquity.

CHAPTER V.

APPLICATION OF THE SUBJECT.

Is popery a *new* way, and the religion of protestants the *old* religion taught by Christ and his apostles? Then this is 1. A *safe* way, and a safe religion; in it you may be justified, sanctified, and surely saved. It is the old way in which Paul, and Peter, and believers in the primitive times, obtained an everlasting kingdom and crown. Be not alarmed at the uncharitable and groundless doctrine of the papists, that out of their church there is no salvation. 2. Then it is the *wisest* way. The folly of men shows itself in the new ways of popery, and wherein they profess themselves to be wise, they are become fools; but in the old way is manifest the manifold wisdom of God. 3. Then it is the *purest* way. The nearer the fountain, the purer are the streams; the nearer the copy, the fairer is the writing. The church of Rome vainly glories in titles of holiness; “the most *holy* pope;” “the *holy* church;” “the multitude of *holy* days;” “*holy* rites and ceremonies,” &c. That one is holy and pure, which is consonant to the holy and pure word of God. If you are to travel, you would go the cleanest way. You are travelling to an everlasting state: the old way of faith in Christ, repentance for

sin, inward holiness, and new obedience, taught in the reformed churches, agreeably to the doctrine of Christ, and his apostles, is the way to keep a clean and pure heart, a clean and pure conscience, to have a clean and pure conversation. 4. It is the *nearest* way. If you leave this way, the further you go, the more you are out of your way. 5. It is the most *comfortable* and most *pleasant* way; all the ways of wisdom are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace. It may be strewed with outward troubles, briers and thorns, but there is inward peace and joy, solid, sure and lasting comfort to be found in it. 6. It is the *only* way. The way of faith in Christ, the way of regeneration and holiness, the way of new obedience and perseverance therein, is the old way to heaven, and there is no other. If you will choose new ways yourselves, or walk in new ways marked out by others, contrary to the good old way, you will lose God and Christ, and your souls for ever.

Protestant reader, endeavour to get a right understanding of the greatness of your mercy; that you were not born in an age of popish darkness; that you have ministers to teach you the good old way, and magistrates to defend you therein; that you are not burned at a stake for not receiving new popish doctrines; that you have the Bible in your own language, and none dare forbid you to read it.

Pray to God for the continuance of this mercy to you and to your children after you; that popery

may never prevail in this happy land, but that the generations to come may be taught the protestant religion, that is, the good old way to heaven, and that your children, and childrens' children may enjoy the Bible, and have the old truths of God preached to them. For their sakes pray much.

Then walk in this good old way. If you see the way to happiness and do not walk in it, you will fall short of it. You may be protestants in opinion, and yet be for ever damned. A drunken protestant, an unclean protestant, a swearing, impenitent, unbelieving protestant, shall not be saved, because in opinion he is a protestant. You may refuse to commit idolatry in bowing to images in a popish chapel, and yet be condemned for making an idol of your money, and for your immoderate love of the world. You might renounce the pope as head, and in judgment own Christ, as only head of his church, and yet be damned for not believing on him, choosing him before all, nor loving him above all.

Let all old corrupt things be done away; your old ignorance, your old false hopes, your old self-love, your old false peace, your old enmity against God and holiness. You must be cut off from the old stock. In a word, (for I can but name a few of many that might be said for the practical improvement of this subject,) crucify the old man, destroy the body of sin. For to keep your old hearts and yet think to go to heaven, is to look for a new way of salvation.

Except you be thus made new, you may know the good old way, but you cannot walk in it; which if you do not, wo, wo, a thousand woes to you for ever. How fearful will be the condemnation of an ungodly protestant, who was told which was the good old and only way, and lived under the constant, plain and powerful preaching of the same doctrines that Christ himself and his apostles delivered. I profess your case will be worse, and your torments will be greater, than of the heathen who might say, Lord, we never had a Bible, never heard of Christ, nor of the way of salvation; no ministers were sent to us, no gospel preached to us. Yea, worse will be your case, and greater will be your damnation, than of many amongst the papists, who have not been so plainly taught, so frequently instructed, so faithfully warned, so earnestly entreated, as you have been. You are not told, that "ignorance is the mother of devotion," as they are; you are not kept from reading the Scripture, as they are; but are pressed, urged and exhorted to it. You have not public worship in an unknown tongue, but by plain language you are warned of hell, and commanded, in the name of God, to forsake your old wicked ways. How oft have you been persuaded to come to Christ, who is "the way, the truth, and the life?" How long has God waited? and will you go on in your wicked ways still; in your old course of profaneness and lying, and Sabbath-breaking? in your old course of careless ne-

glect of God, and Christ, and your own immortal souls? That is an old way indeed, but it is not the *good old way*. If you will go on, take your course; if you will not turn to the good path, take what falls. But know that the way of sin leads directly to hell. And can you there have rest? How can you, under the heavy load of God's wrath? How can you, under the strokes of an angry, provoked and revenging God? You cannot rest upon a bed of down, though your conscience be seared, when God afflicts you with the stone or plague, or burning fever, though all your friends be round about you, administering cordials and comforts. And can you rest in a bed of flames, in a burning fiery furnace, in a place more dreadful and more hot than is a vessel full of boiling lead, and burning brimstone, when your conscience shall be awakened, and an angry God shall frown upon you, and not one nigh to pity or relieve? For God's sake, and for your soul's sake, as ever you would avoid endless, and remediless torments hereafter, walk in the good old way of faith and holiness, repentance and new obedience now.

And if you will now walk in this good old way, you shall be taken into a new covenant, and have new employment, better, more noble, more profitable, more pleasant than ever yet you were engaged in. You shall be taken into new relations, to be the sons of God, the daughters of God, the servants, people and friends of God. You shall become a

new habitation for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. You will have ground of comfort when you come to die. Death is the old way into another world; and if you walk in the good old way while you live, you may be comforted, if you can appeal to God, having the witness of a good conscience, and say, now, Lord, remember how I have walked before thee in the good path, with an upright heart. And then you shall enter into the new Jerusalem, where you shall have universal, seasonable, eternal, and delightful rest. You shall rest from the reigning, and conflicting power of sin, from the guilt and indwelling of sin. You shall rest from the temptations of Satan. He shall never trouble nor disquiet you more. Commission of sin is now a burden to you, and temptation to sin is now a burden to you, but the good old way will bring to rest from both. You shall rest from all afflictions upon your bodies. Now sickness is a burden that makes you restless, but then you shall have an aching head no more, pained bowels, a sick heart no more for ever. You shall rest from all troubles from men; from all their persecutions, slanders and reproaches. You shall rest from repentings and mournings for sin, from all the pains that you are now at to mortify corruption; though not from loving of God, delighting in God, and admiring his love, nay this your love shall be one part of your rest. You shall rest from all doubts and fears, and jealousies of heart. Now you doubt, "Does God love me? do I love God? is Christ

mine, and am I his? will God pardon and save me? Sometimes I hope he will, and that lightens my heart; sometimes I fear he will not, and that is a heavy burden to my soul, under which I cannot rest." But this good old way will bring you to a rest where you shall doubt no more, and fear no more. Can you doubt, whether it is day, when you see the sun shine? or that fire is hot, when you see it burn, and feel its warmth? No more shall you doubt, when you come to the end of your walk in the good old way, whether God loves you, when you shall be filled with his love, and feel that he loves you, and see to what a blessed place of rest and peace, of life, of light and joy, his love has brought you.

POPISH PERVERSION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Whereas the church of Rome accuses protestants of perverting and corrupting the word of God, it is easy to prove that the charge may be retorted with triumphant success.

The insertion of an intermingled apocrypha is in itself sufficient proof of the correctness of this affirmation. And it is further confirmed by the care that has been manifestly taken to render the translation of the Scriptures a vehicle for the diffusion of popish tenets. One specimen will suffice: the word "repentance" is almost invariably translated "penance," even in the Old Testament, where, it must be confessed, it sounds oddly enough; for instance, "Therefore I reprehend myself, and *do penance* in dust and ashes," Job. xlii. 6. "If the wicked *do penance* for all the sins which he hath committed, &c. Ezek. xviii. 21. "If they *do penance* in their heart in the place of their captivity," &c. 1 Kings viii. 47. "*Do penance*, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," Mat. iv. 17! "that they should *do penance*, and turn to God, doing works worthy of *penance*," Acts xxvi. 20. The design of this rendering is obvious.*

* The following note on Rom. iv. 7, 8, is an affecting instance of perversion of the word of God.

"*Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.* That is, blessed are those who, by doing penance, have obtained pardon and remission of their sins, and also are *covered*; that is, newly clothed with the habit of grace, and vested with the stole of charity.

"*Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin.* That is, blessed is the man who hath retained his baptismal innocence, that no grievous sin can be imputed to him. And

The suppression of the second commandment, in which the worship of images is prohibited, is usually considered as one article of accusation against the Roman Catholic church. The fact is this: the first and second precepts of the decalogue are blended into one, and the tenth is divided into two. This division is adopted, they say, in deference to the authority of Augustine; be this as it may, it answers their purpose. In catechisms, spelling-books, and small works for the instruction of the young, the decalogue is often given in an abridged form, by which arrangement, the second commandment (that is, *our* second commandment,) is entirely kept out of sight: thus—

1. “I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no strange gods before me.

2. “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

3. “Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath-day.

4. “Honour thy father and thy mother.

5. “Thou shalt not kill.

6. “Thou shalt not commit adultery.

7. “Thou shalt not steal.

8. “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

9. “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife.

10. “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s goods.”

This is copied from *Butler’s Catechism*; a work extensively used in Ireland. A similar abridgment of the decalogue is inserted in the spelling-book

likewise, blessed is the man, who, after falling into sin, hath done penance and leads a virtuous life by frequenting the sacraments necessary for obtaining the grace to prevent a relapse, that sin is no more imputed to him.” *Roman Catholic Version.*

commonly found in Italian schools, but with this difference, that the *fourth* commandment is omitted as well as the second, and that instead of the injunction to observe the Sabbath, the young Italian reads, "Remember to keep holy *the days of festivals!*"*

The following fact is perhaps known only to few; it deserves some imperishable record. In the year 1685, Louis XVI. revoked the Edict of Nantes, deprived the protestants of their civil and religious privileges, and forced hundreds of thousands of them to leave their native land, and seek an asylum where they might worship God without molestation and restraint. But it was soon found that protestantism, though oppressed, was not destroyed. A new line of policy was then adopted. The papists saw that they could not prevent the Scriptures from being read, and therefore resolved to force the sacred volume itself into their service, by the most audacious corruptions and interpolations. An edition of the New Testament was published, *so translated, that a Roman catholic might find in it explicit statements of the peculiar dogmas of his church.* The book was printed at Bordeaux, in 1686. It was entitled, "The New Testament of our Saviour Jesus Christ. Translated from Latin into French, by the divines of Louvain:" and the attestation of the archbishop of Bordeaux was prefixed to it, assuring the reader that it was "carefully revised and corrected." Two doctors in divinity of the university of the same place also recommended it as useful to all those, who, *with permis-*

* Gilly's Travels in Piedmont, p. 167. Grahame's "Three Month's Residence in the Mountains east of Rome," p. 238. It is observable, that though the tenth commandment is thus split into two, the two are again blended into one in the explanations given in Roman Catholic Catechisms. Is not this a tacit confession that the division is untenable?

sion of their superiors, might read it. A few quotations will show the manner in which the work was executed, and the object which the translators had in view.

In the summary of the "contents" of Matthew xxvi. Mark xiv. and Luke xxii. it is said that those chapters contain the account of the "institution of the mass!" Acts xiii. 2. ("as they ministered to the Lord and fasted") is thus rendered—"*as they offered to the Lord the sacrifice of the mass*, and fasted," &c. In Acts xi. 30, and other places, where our English version has the word "elders," this edition has "*priests*."

A practice that has proved very productive of gain to the priesthood, is made scriptural in the following manner: "And his father and mother went every year *in pilgrimage* to Jersusalem," Luke ii. 41. "And not only so, but also he was appointed by the churches the companion of our *pilgrimage*," 2 Cor. viii. 19. "Beloved, thou actest as a true believer in all that thou doest towards the brethren, and towards the *pilgrims*." 3 John 5.

Tradition is thus introduced:—"Ye keep my commandments, as I left them with you *by tradition*," 1 Cor. xi. 2. "The faith, which has been once given to the saints *by tradition*." Jude 5.

That the Roman Catholic might be able to prove that marriage is a sacrament, he was furnished with these renderings:—"To those who are joined together *in the sacrament of marriage*, I command," &c. 1 Cor. vii. 10. "Do not join yourselves *in the sacrament of marriage* with unbelievers." 2 Cor. vi. 14.

1 Cor. ix. 5, is so directly opposed to the constrained *celibacy of the clergy*, that we can scarcely wonder at finding an addition to the text: it stands thus—"Have we not power to lead about a sister,

a woman to serve us in the gospel, and to remember us with her goods, as the other apostles, &c.

In support of *human merit*, the translation of Heb. xiii. 16, may be quoted—"We *obtain merit towards God* by such sacrifices."

Purgatory could not be introduced but by a direct interpolation: "He himself shall be saved, yet in all cases as by *the fire of purgatory*." 1 Cor. iii. 15.

Many other passages might be noticed. "Him only shalt thou serve *with latría*," i. e. with the worship specially and solely due to God: this addition was evidently made to prevent the text being urged against the invocation of the saints; Luke iv. 8. "Many of those who believed, came *to confess and declare their sins*." Acts xix. 18. "After a *procession* of seven days round it." Heb. xi. 30. "Beware, lest being led away with others, *by the error of the wicked heretics*," &c. 2 Pet. iii. 17. "There is some sin which is not *mortal*, but *venial*." 1 John v. 17. "And round about the throne there were twenty-four thrones, and on the thrones twenty-four *priests* seated, all clothed with *albs*," Rev. iv. 4. The *alb*, it will be recollected, is part of the official attire of a Roman catholic priest.

But the most flagrant interpolation occurs in 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some will separate themselves from the *Roman faith*, giving themselves up to spirits of error, and to doctrines *taught by devils*. Speaking false things through hypocrisy, having also the conscience cauterised. *Condemning the sacrament of marriage, the abstinence from meats*, which God hath created for the faithful, and for those who have known the truth, to receive them with thanksgiving."

Such was the Bordeaux New Testament. Whether

it was actually translated by the divines of Louvain is doubtful. This is certain, however, that it was printed by the royal and university printer, and sanctioned by dignitaries of the church. It is proper to add, that the Roman Catholics were soon convinced of the folly of their conduct, in thus tampering with the inspired volume. To avoid the just odium brought on their cause by this wicked measure, they have endeavoured to destroy the whole edition. In consequence, the book is now excessively scarce.

“Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be re-
proved.” John iii. 20.

CRAMP'S TEXT BOOK OF POPERY.

THE END.

683

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Jan. 2006

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 318 463 3